Nowhere was Somewhere

HOW HISTORY MAKES UTOPIAS AND HOW UTOPIAS MAKE HISTORY

BY

Arthur E. Morgan

Chapel Hill, 1946

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

Copyright, 1946, by
The University of North Carolina Press

Printed in the United States of America

VAN REES PRESS • NEW YORK • PJ

Contents

INTRODUCTION

The Significance of Utopia 3

PART ONE

Nowhere Was Somewhere

I Model for Utopia 17
II On the Trail of Utopian Sources 33
III Non-Utopian Parallels 61
IV Hythloday, First Circumnavigator? 79

PART TWO

The Utopian Tradition

V The Origins of Utopia 91
VI The Golden Age 120
VII Characteristics and Use of Utopias 152
VIII Why Utopias Fail 165
IX Beyond Utopia 177
Appendix: Concerning Early Voyages to South America 187
Notes 213
Index 225

INTRODUCTION

The Significance of Utopia

ONLY A UTOPIA! HOW OFTEN HAVE PICtures of a possible government and society been dismissed with those words! Yet if we could follow the threads of influence of the world's great utopias as they have entered into the fabric of government and public policy, we should come to have a high regard for the influence of these designs of a good society which have appeared so persistently through the ages.*

Utopias are as essential to human society as plans are essential for building bridges. During perhaps a hundred thousand years men built bridges without conscious plans, but they were mostly little bridges. Larger undertakings often failed through unrecognized weaknesses, or, if they did persist, it was often with extremely wasteful use of labor and materials.

When an engineer builds a great bridge he is creating something the exact like of which never before existed. Yet the cost of construction is so great, and the loss by failure would be so serious, that cut-and-try methods are out of the question. The very first effort must be successful. There

* The word "utopia" is used in these pages not only in its specific sense but also with broader application, to include plans of government or schemes for social improvement which present the possibilities of a good society.

enters the need for design, which must be based on principles established by both theory and experiment. The success of this process is indicated by the fact that our country contains thousands of great structures, each one in its totality different from every other; yet each representing success of the first effort, as well as a high degree of economy and efficiency. Only with deliberate, intelligent, over-all design can economy be combined with effectiveness, and the full possibilities of available resources be realized.

For the most part societies have been developed much as men built bridges before the days of formal planning. For long ages, however, men have occasionally realized the inadequacy of cut-and-try methods. Repeatedly persons of creative imagination have given suggestions and hints of orderly social design. These are our utopias. Futile though they may seem, they have been in fact among the most powerful formative forces in history.

When a man or a people of tremendous energy and vitality appears, with a feeling of manifest destiny, great *power* of action is not necessarily associated with a correspondingly great *pattern* of action. If no sound pattern of life and of society is available, the drive of energy may expend itself in a whirlwind of destructive force, perhaps across the face of a continent, as was the case with Genghis Khan and his horde; or it may have a pattern without special excellence, as was the case with Napoleon. Where a great outpouring of energy is given form and design by a reasonably adequate pattern, then a great social structure may develop, as was the case in America when its people formulated and followed the utopia known as the Constitution of the United States.

"Human nature" has not the rigidly fixed character that commonly has been assumed. Rather, it has an almost unhampered teachableness, ready to learn and to adopt any pattern, whether good, bad, or indifferent, that is most effectively presented to it. The limitation is not with human

nature, but with the quality of prevailing social patterns. The work of the utopian is to discover or to create better patterns, and to present them so effectively that they will win the acceptance of men.

The social structure of an anthill is inexorably fixed in the inborn nature of ants. There is almost no freedom of choice. In the design of human society, however, there *is* freedom. Contrary to the opinion frequently advanced by some Marxians, there is no single type of society toward which, through economic determinism or otherwise, all society is compelled to move.

The history of human society has been a history of diversity. No one type of organization has been exclusively dominant throughout the world and through the ages, and no one form includes all the values and excludes all unfavorable elements. Men's inherent impulses and make-up do not compel them to uniformity of social organization. As a result of this indeterminateness there has been, both in practice and in theory, a vast amount of exploration for desirable forms of social organization.

Not all types of society are equally conducive to a good life, and a social organization adapted to a people with one cultural background may be unsuitable for men with a greatly different tradition. The best combination of elements for any society probably has never existed, just as no bridge built by traditional methods ever was so nearly perfect that it could not be improved. So the designing of utopias goes on and has gone on since before men began to record their aspirations in writing; and it must go on, or social evolution will cease. Sometimes the utopian is not himself remarkably efficient as a man of action, though in a surprising proportion of cases he has been a person of notable achievements.

The great utopian has been like an oak tree in the forest, which year after year has striven to realize that perfect design which it is in the spirit of an oak tree to express, but

without full success. A falling tree has broken its branches; other trees have crowded it, robbed it of its sunlight, and left it lopsided. Yet it persists, producing acorns, in each of which its spirit of perfection is transmitted whole and unimpaired. Perhaps some of these will grow in more favorable circumstances and come closer to perfection. The utopian has had in himself a vision and a pattern of a good society. In the adverse circumstances of his time he could not bring that design to fulfillment. Yet he feels it has innate worth, and he reproduces it in embryo in the form of a utopia, as the oak tree produces acorns, and he scatters copies broadcast over the earth, hoping that at least one of them may find a favored place to grow.

Men rarely exhibit sheer originality. Generally they do not create anew, but adapt and use what they have. When by chance, or in the achievement of ambition, or in a desire to serve country or mankind, a man or a group of men comes into great power and undertakes to create a new pattern of government, seldom does that new design originate in the minds of those in power or in the minds of their advisers. Men at such times commonly find themselves at an impasse. Here they are, with power to provide a new constitution for the state. A new order is needed. But no good pattern is suddenly revealed to them. What can they do? The most practical course, and the one which men in such positions generally follow, is to seize upon and put to use the most promising suggestions that are at hand, adapting them to the existing conditions, as Napoleon undertook to do with the "perfect" utopian constitution of the Abbé Sieyès.

More than most constitutions, that of the United States was a product of conscious, deliberate design. Yet, in so far as it was more than a codification of existing English and colonial practice, it was greatly influenced by writers of utopias, as well as by political economists such as John Locke. Rous-

seau's utopian *Social Contract* was influential in the formation of American policy. Such a major element as the separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial functions of government, which for a century and a half has been imposingly defended by judges and statesmen as a foundation of our liberties, apparently was taken, along with other important elements, from the most popular utopia of the time, Harrington's *Oceana.* This utopian pattern of government appears to have contributed substantially, not only to the federal Constitution, but, at an earlier date, to the constitutions of several of the thirteen states.*

* Because of a single reference by Madison in the *Federalist* (Home Library Edition, pp. 313-15), it has been commonly assumed that the idea of separate legislative, executive, and judicial functions was taken from Montesquieu. The following considerations (mostly from *Harrington and his Oceana,* by H. F. Russell-Smith, Cambridge University Press, 1914) point rather to Harrington's *Oceana.*

In the essay in which Montesquieu is mentioned, Madison refers to the provisions which were included in the constitutions already adopted by several states, for separating executive, legislative, and judicial functions. These provisions throw additional light on the question. John Adams, a fervent admirer of Harrington's *Oceana,* prepared the draft for the constitution of Massachusetts, which was adopted with few changes and has been but little modified to the present. As an indication that the parallel between *Oceana* and the Massachusetts constitution was not accidental or unconscious, in the convention which adopted the constitution the motion was offered and seconded that the word "Massachusetts" be expunged and that the word "Oceana" be substituted.—*Harrington and his Oceana,* p. 194.

William Penn probably was familiar with *Oceana,* and John Adams helped in drafting the post-revolutionary constitution of Pennsylvania. Of Penn's first constitution, Benjamin Franklin wrote that it "savored very strongly of Harrington and his *Oceana.*" Adams also helped in drafting the constitutions of Virginia and New York, which partially follow *Oceana.* While the various state constitutions were being drafted, Adams' paper on constitutional principles, in which he discussed Harrington's *Oceana* and to a considerable degree followed it, was one of the relatively few commentaries which had general circulation in the colonies. When the federal constitution was drafted, it followed the

The American Constitution, offspring of utopias as it was, became itself a utopia to be taken, often blindly and uncritically, as the fundamental law of many other nations. Few other national constitutions have been so many times imitated.

This habit of using utopias in building constitutions did not begin in America. It is at least as old as European history. In the days of Greater Greece, when colonies were being planted from Spain to the Black Sea, constitutions and codes were designed for them, sometimes apparently more philosophical and utopian than the American Constitution. Also, colonies begun in the great periods of India grew into empires and lasted for many centuries. Some of these, too, had "utopian" constitutions prepared for them in advance. The French Revolution, the socialist movement, and the Constitution of Soviet Russia are in considerable degree examples of the reflection of utopian thinking and writing on the course of events, and the process is as old as recorded history.

Among the utopias and utopian writings which have powerfully influenced fundamental state policies are Plato's *Republic*, Plutarch's idealized *Lycurgus*, St. Augustine's *City of God*, More's *Utopia*, Campanella's *City of the Sun*, Andreae's *Christianopolis*, Harrington's *Oceana*, Rousseau's *Social Contract*, Robert Owen's utopian writings summed up in *The Book of the New Moral World*, and Bellamy's *Looking*

majority of the states in important respects, such as separation of legislative, executive, and judicial functions.

Oceana was published in 1656, the first constitution of Pennsylvania in 1682, and Montesquieu's *Spirit of Laws* in 1748. According to Russell-Smith, "Montesquieu was certainly acquainted with Harrington. In one place he coupled him with Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, and More."

These facts tend to the conclusion that it was Harrington's *Oceana*, more than Montesquieu's *Spirit of Laws*, which was the primary source of those provisions in the state and federal constitutions that follow the pattern of Harrington's utopian writing.

Backward. These books do not by any means exhaust the list of influential utopias, but they are representative.

Not only in its Constitution but in its later development, the government and policy of the United States have been greatly influenced by utopian writing. Bellamy's *Looking Backward* largely crystallized and gave form to liberal thinking in America. It gave birth to the "Nationalist" movement, the principles of which in turn were fumblingly adopted by the Populist party. Then the Democratic party took over Populist doctrines and further infected America with them. William Jennings Bryan's famous "cross of gold" speech was but a paraphrase from *Looking Backward.*

The "New Deal" has presented to America new forms of social organization. Here, too, I believe we can be skeptical of the originality of the "brain trusters," and can with profit ask the question, "What utopias are finding expression?"

It may be that the long-range direction and import of the New Deal can be made much clearer by reading Bellamy's *Looking Backward.* This assumption is not simply wild conjecture. For instance, Adolf Berle, one of the earliest, most intimate, and longest lasting of the confidential advisory group, was very deeply influenced by that source. His father was a friend and disciple of Bellamy. He grew up in a family in which Bellamy was a prophet of light, and in which *Looking Backward* was somewhat like a family Bible. This man's personal expressions of economic policy correspond to the philosophy of *Looking Backward* to a degree which seems to preclude mere chance. Striking parallels may be drawn between *Looking Backward* and various important and detailed elements of New Deal public policy. It may be said with considerable force that to understand the long-range implications of the New Deal one must read *Looking Backward.*

When we have demonstrated that new patterns of government, where they are more than codification of existing

practice, commonly are borrowed and adapted from utopias, we have only half an answer to the problem of the origins of constitutions. There remains the question, What are the origins of utopias? Are they "bolts from the blue," sudden flashes of creative imagination, new revelations from heaven, or are they the original products of sheer logic? If statesmen who suddenly find themselves in possession of power lack the creative quality to originate the patterns of government they need, are utopians a different breed of men? Do they have strange ability to draw wisdom direct from heaven, to pass it on to the practical heads of government?

The answer is no; utopians have no such power. Nature is extremely parsimonious of originality. Very seldom does she create something new on a large scale. Nearly always she works over and uses what she already has. Utopians are no exception to this rule. Very generally, as this book endeavors to show, the great utopias have borrowed from earlier utopias, until sometimes the trail is lost in the distant past. But the tracing of that course only postpones the answer to our question, even though, along the way, striking new elements have entered into the growing utopian pattern.

The great fact which we come upon in the course of our inquiry is that, in their beginnings, utopias are not solely the creations of men's fancies, or revelations, or the products of pure logic; but to a very considerable degree they are records of actual human experience. Though they may be dressed in modern garb and adapted to existing conditions, in their fundamental characteristics many significant utopias are largely pictures of societies that have existed. In some cases the facts are well known and undisputed. For instance, Harrington, before writing the *Oceana*, which so greatly influenced American constitutions, traveled over Europe observing the effectiveness of various forms of government, and came back to England with such great admiration for the governments of some of the Italian city-states that to a

considerable degree they provided his pattern. Harrington, Montesquieu, and others also were influenced by accounts of the ancient, pre-empire Roman Republic. How few American statesmen, orating on the priceless values of the American form of government, are aware of their various sources!

Many utopian themes can be traced back into the distant past until they blend into the utopian visions of the Hebrew prophets or into legends of the Golden Age. Is there evidence that even here we have, not revelations from heaven, not just fanciful creations of the imagination, but faint records of actual human societies? The writer believes there is such evidence, and he has indicated its general nature in the chapter on "The Golden Age."

A no less striking conclusion refers to the origin of that great utopian tradition which began with More's *Utopia.* In many remarkable elements More's picture of society differs from all the utopias and utopian writings which had preceded it for more than two thousand years. To the European mind it presented something new under the sun. And for more than four hundred years after More wrote, men searched vainly for the source of those strange new elements. The writer takes the position that he has located that source. He finds it to be not in earlier utopian writings, so much as in the actual existence of a civilized society then almost totally unknown to Europeans. It is a telling comment on cynical critics of the foremost utopias of English-speaking peoples, More's *Utopia* and Bellamy's *Looking Backward,* that their appraisals of "impossible" and "contrary to human nature" have been applied to pictures of society which were generally true descriptions of actual societies operating with a high degree of effectiveness, over a vast area, and for a long period.

While imitation and adaptation have been the chief resources of utopians and social innovators, they have not been the only methods by which progress is achieved. For long

periods men may improve their lot by accumulations of slight changes in the way of doing things. Then come combinations of great need and creative genius, to bring about fundamentally new ways of meeting those needs. The utopian in a measure has realized this. Instead of endeavoring to bring about a good society by an accumulation of small modifications in existing custom, he endeavors to appraise the long-range needs and possibilities of men and, free from emotional attachment to the past, undertakes to design a radically new way of social life which will meet those needs and fulfill those possibilities. Yet often this strikingly new way was not an original idea of the utopian, but was suggested by the example of some actual society.

Today as never before this process of fundamental analysis and radically new design is necessary. In the past century and a half, men have discovered or created the agencies which make possible the emergence of a great, complex social organism. These agencies include steam, electric power, mechanical transportation, complex machinery and mass-production manufacture, modern communication, corporate organization, and administrative technique. These are not the tools of individual men, but the organs of a living society.

Yet mankind has not settled upon any pattern of design by which these new and unprecedented organs of society shall be incorporated into a social organism. The time seems to be at hand when slight modifications of the social order will not suffice, but fundamental changes of design will be necessary. The world's recent titanic struggle was between varying ideologies, each of which aims at some sort of utopia, though it may be a perverted or distorted one.

Society today is more in a state of flux than at any time since empire and feudalism, several thousand years ago, began to supplant the small, largely isolated communities which had been the habitation of man perhaps from his earliest days on the earth. This present intensity of flux probably will not

continue indefinitely. Society will crystallize into relatively stable forms, with new or old designs. Ability to use atomic energy enormously increases the necessity for adequate social design, though it does not equally contribute to our capacity to create that design.

How will those designs be determined? In some degree, by means of the newly developed scientific method, fundamentally new types of social structure may be created which are not reproductions of the past, as men invented and perfected the telephone and the radio instead of developing existing means of communication. Yet, though to an increasing degree scientific design may replace older processes of merely rearranging the patterns of life, the existence of actual cases often suggests to the scientist what he will search for. Would synthetic rubber ever have been invented if natural rubber had not pointed the way? Would synthetic quinine, synthetic indigo, or synthetic alcohol have been found if the natural products had not previously existed? Similarly, would the creative designs of utopians have emerged without the suggestions of historic cases? And would radically new governmental regimes begin without the suggestions of utopias?

In the field of actual government and social order, for long periods to come the social patterns men live by will be those which their dynamic but none too original-minded leaders find lying about ready for use. It has been the work of the utopians, borrowing from earlier utopians, from their actual experience, and from information about society, to select the most excellent elements from all recorded experience, to add whatever they can of creative originality, and to combine those elements into a design for society which will commend itself to the judgment of men.

The trouble with human society has been, not too much attention to utopias, but too little. Had the quest for a good society been more universal, more objective, more critical and

discriminating, then the crude social systems presented to the world by popular heroes would seem naïve and unconvincing and would not gain the credulous loyalty of great masses. Where utopias have been held in highest and most discriminating regard, there society has been at its best. A knowledge of the history and characteristics of utopias is essential to anyone who would take part in the refashioning of political, social, and economic institutions. They constitute one of the greatest reservoirs of human experience and aspiration.

Thus we find a constant interaction between the ideas and dreams of men, and their actual achievements. Utopian dreams have vastly influenced practical plans for government, while the best that men have done in government and society has entered into the making of utopias. To trace the interesting course of this interaction is the aim of this volume. It introduces the reader to a process of social thought and action which, notwithstanding the many histories of utopias which have been written, is yet largely an unexplored field.

PART ONE

NOWHERE WAS SOMEWHERE

I

Model for Utopia

FOR OVER FOUR HUNDRED YEARS CRITICS of Thomas More's *Utopia,* and for over half a century critics of Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward,* have held that these descriptions of a good society were only dreams, beautiful of course, but in reality quite impossible, being in conflict with human nature. Because of that assumption, "utopian" came to be a synonym of the visionary and impracticable.

What if the great *Utopia* of Thomas More was not a product of his imagination, but a generally representative account of an actual country and its social system? What if the social system he described had long been in actual and successful existence on a vast scale? And what if the self-satisfied conclusion of "practical" men during the centuries since More's day—that his *Utopia* is an impracticable dream and contrary to human nature—is controverted by the actual facts? What if, instead of a fanciful "nobody," the supposed narrator in *Utopia* was an actual traveler bringing back a true story of his travels? Would not such conclusions be startling? Yet they are strongly implied by a comparison of More's *Utopia* with the best historical records.

Thomas More's *Utopia* consists essentially of two separate works, with different themes. The first part, which is a criticism of English government and society, was written last. The

second part is the story of a strange land of strange ways. The two parts are somewhat loosely tied together by placing a few paragraphs referring to Utopia at the beginning and at the end of the first part.

In writing his famous work More allowed himself to express more than one interest. He criticized the drift of English political and social policy. He discussed Plato's philosophy. Two friends, Linacre and Grocyn, recently returned from Italy with a knowledge of Greek, had begun to teach that new subject at Oxford, and More had been one of their earliest students. Later association with Colet and Erasmus stimulated his interest in the "new learning," and he gave expression to that interest in his book. He took liberties with time, place, and circumstance, making the description of the strange land carry whatever burden was on his mind. He did not hesitate to invent or improvise. Concerning the length of time More's informant spent in "Utopia," and concerning his varied activities there, much of fiction and invention is evident. Yet these elements are, on the whole, easily discernible and separable from the main theme.

The chief content of the second part of More's famous narrative is, in effect, a substantially accurate description of a remarkable economic and social order which was in existence when More wrote his book. If the similarities are more than incidental we can say that with the discovery of that strange society a new element entered the current of utopian thought.

Even more significant, and quite aside from the question of literary source, such a comparison is important as supplying explicit evidence that a utopia like that of Thomas More or of Bellamy is not impossible or "contrary to human nature." If substantially the social order described in More's *Utopia*—Greek for "nowhere"—actually was *somewhere*, in full, vigorous, and successful operation, the main question then tends to become, not whether such a utopia is possible, but whether it is desirable. And as we compare that remarkable economy

with striking resemblances in the New Deal, we can have new light on both the possibilities and the price of such a regime.

At the time when Europe was slowly emerging from the so-called Dark Ages, there existed on the other side of the globe a great empire, several times as populous as England and more extensive than any state on the European continent, within whose borders there was more nearly universal economic security than the civilized world had known. This remarkable empire had been formed by the gradual consolidation, partly by mutual consent and partly by military power, of many separate communities which had strong and stable social and economic organization running back many centuries to primitive folkways. Most of the elements in this social economy had existed in these smaller units before they were united. As usual, military force did not create the social values, but consolidated and regimented them, and, in the end, perhaps contributed to their downfall.

Throughout this great super-community there was substantial equality and security, with neither poverty nor conspicuous wealth. The local communities were linked together in such a way that scarcity in any one section could be quickly taken care of from surpluses in other parts of the realm. After unknown centuries of the gradual development of small utopia-like communities, they united into several independent nations, of which the strongest began to annex the others until it became dominant. This empire rose rapidly between the year 1100 and the middle of the sixteenth century. Instead of submerging the underlying community culture as did feudal Europe, the dominant empire magnified and glorified it. Today we know this great empire by the name of ancient Peru, or the empire of the Incas.

Before entering upon the question of whether Thomas More acquired his utopian ideas from descriptions of ancient Peru, it will be helpful to have a brief view of this remark-

able society. Fortunately, historians who during the past century have examined the copious Spanish records of that early civilization are agreed as to its principal characteristics.

Prescott,[1] Markham,[2] and Means [3] are the three principal students of ancient Peru who wrote in English. Their study and research span almost an entire century and tell a connected and documented story of that ancient empire. And so thoroughly did the first of them, Prescott, do his work that Means, the authority of our day, has said that except for a few points, which he discussed in detail, "Prescott's account of the Inca Empire and all that pertains to it is as good and as trustworthy as any modern account. . . ." [4]

Stretched along the western coast of South America, the Inca empire spread over an area so extensive that its farthest parts were almost as widely separated as Alaska and Florida. Its population probably was much greater than that of any European country of its time. Its government was more thoroughly organized than any then existing in Europe. Its great road system compared favorably with that of Rome at the crest of her power; its irrigation system made those of Babylon and Nineveh seem elementary; its postal system was far better than any in Europe. A comprehensive system of public storehouses, with a closely knit government administration, made it possible for the empire to function as an economic and political whole.

These ancient Americans evolved their complex economic, social, and political organization uninfluenced by the stream of European and Asiatic culture. They were so separated from the rest of the world that they lacked a written language, knew nothing of the wheel and the axle either for vehicles or machines, did not use the arch in building, and had neither horses nor cattle. In spite of these handicaps they developed varied and extensive public works. In the production and distribution of their consumer goods to give universal

economic security, they succeeded more completely than any other nation of their day or since.

At the time of the Spanish conquest, the Inca emperor (called the Inca) and his subordinates had a power over persons and property no less absolute than that of the modern dictator of a corporate state, and the Inca's family gave conquering Spaniards the impression that they alone had created the system. But historical research has made it clear that the fundamental social and economic structure of Peru was not the invention of a shrewd ruler and his family at the top, but rather was the slowly evolved folkway of democratically organized tribal communities which had widespread existence long before they began to cohere into a great empire. According to Philip Ainsworth Means, "Enough is known today to banish forever the old idea, fostered chiefly by the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, that all order, well-being, and social stability in the Andean area was due to the Incas. We know that the foundations of their polity were laid long before they rose to power." [5]

In discussing the origin of the public control of land, Means wrote:

> The *ayllu* [tribe] from the earliest times was the cell of the social organism. . . . But in every sort of state, whether small and simple or large and complex, the *ayllu* owned the land collectively, distributing the usufruct of it among the heads of the households in the *ayllu*. Under the Incas the *ayllu* continued to own its land collectively, but with this difference: all the land was not in the hands of the *ayllus*. Land was divided into three portions: one for the Sun, *i.e.*, the state religion; one for the Inca; and one for the *ayllus*.[6]

It is contended by some scholars that the later centralized absolutism which the Spaniards found was already bringing on its own destruction before the invaders gave it the final blow. However, conquests and changes of government

through the centuries prior to Columbus had not changed the basic social structure, any more than military victories and political revolutions changed the general social pattern of Europe. Whether the particular dynasty of the day was about to fall, we cannot be sure, but in any case we have proof that social security under an economy of relative abundance existed in an earlier America, and we know something of how the dictators who gained control of that ancient system maintained themselves in power. In each respect the story has amazing similarities to certain present-day tendencies. The only nation in western South America which never succumbed to Spanish rule was that of the Araucanians of central Chile, who never gave up their democratic form of government.

In both agriculture and industry an all-powerful state exerted control. At the time of marriage—and by law everyone was required to marry at a certain age—each couple was given by the community a house and a plot of ground large enough to support them. Additional land was given as each child was born. As the family decreased in size its property was proportionately diminished. There was no mortgage problem, for a person could not buy new land or dispose of what had been assigned to him. In addition to paying a tax in the form of labor on the lands of the Inca, each person was required to contribute a portion of his time to work the lands of the sick, the aged, the widows and orphans, and the soldiers in active service. Idleness was a crime, but the habit of work was so deeply ingrained in the people that outward compulsion seldom was necessary. The people willingly accepted and fulfilled their responsibilities.

Not only was soil erosion combated by the Inca and his subjects, much as by our Department of Agriculture conservationists, but a large part of the cultivated tracts were actually created by prodigious labor. Since much of their country consisted of steep, rocky mountain slopes, they

laboriously built stone terraces and filled the spaces behind them with broken stone, covered by a layer of soil on which they raised crops. Over thousands of square miles of rugged mountainsides these terraces were so well built that they have survived four centuries of disuse.

The Peruvians appreciated the importance of maintaining soil fertility and made extensive use of guano, the deposit of sea birds which was brought from islands off the coast. To safeguard the supply they carefully regulated the way in which it should be exploited, and protected the birds with a no-hunting game law, the violation of which brought death.

Technically the most difficult agricultural problem was that of securing water for the dry lands along the coast. Over a wide area of the country the Incas built a great network of aqueducts and irrigation canals to bring water from the streams high in the interior down along the arid western slopes and to the coastal desert. Where irrigation was impossible they dug depressions in the desert sands, until ground moisture was reached. Then they heavily fertilized the bottoms and turned them into productive gardens. Thus these people took a region of barren desert and steep mountainsides, transformed it into a land of fabulous wealth, and used that wealth to provide economic security for all the people.

The great flocks of llamas scattered over the high mountain pastures of the Andes were the property of the state. Each year the Inca's officers organized enormous hunting parties. They surrounded large areas, gradually driving all animals toward a center. There they killed the wild beasts which preyed on the flock, and then sheared the llamas. The wool was stored in public warehouses, from which it was distributed to each family according to its requirements, for home spinning and weaving, or was allotted to supply the common needs. Cotton, produced in the low country, also was state property and was likewise distributed according to need.

Underneath the ceremonial of presenting goods to the Sun God and to the Inca, the Peruvian system of public storehouses was essentially comparable to certain features of the New Deal. The sick, the aged, the widowed were supplied from these surpluses, as many American families on relief have been given potatoes, oranges, and other products by the Surplus Commodity Corporation. Moreover, like Henry A. Wallace's "ever-normal granary" plan, large surpluses of corn and other products of good crop years were held over in a vast system of warehouses, to be distributed at the time of poor harvests.

All mining and all manufacturing except the simple craft production for home use were state undertakings. As the people of different sections of the country had developed skills for particular occupations, it was customary to assign woodworking to one district, metal crafts to another, and so on. Road maintenance and mining were the responsibility of the people who lived near where the work was done. Within each district there was frequent rotation of tasks, so that no person should be burdened with an undue share of labor, or should have to neglect the care of his own household. Most goods for food, clothing, and shelter were produced locally, so that the burden of transportation, which was on men's backs or on the backs of llamas, was held to a minimum. There was no system of money wages, but all who worked for the state were supplied with what they needed from public warehouses.

To operate this moneyless economy so that no one should be in want, the Peruvians practiced comprehensive industrial and agricultural planning and exercised continuing government regulation. A vital statistics bureau kept a careful record of all births and deaths, dividing the population into ten classes according to age, and thus the actual number and character of the population was determined annually. Each age class between sixteen and sixty had its own responsibilities.

From time to time there was conducted a comprehensive inventory of the resources and needs of the nation, including the amount of goods of every description in the public storehouses, the quantity and quality of farm land available and the use to which it was put, the mineral deposits which were or could be exploited, the needs of the country for new roads and bridges and aqueducts. On the basis of information thus gathered, work programs were drawn up for the various districts—a sort of "regional planning"—and the local officials were given responsibility for assigning and directing individual work. At the end of each year the Inca sent his officers over the country to compile a register of the year's production in all the various branches of agriculture and industry. Thus he could check alike against tax evasion and local graft. Of greater social significance, this inventory enabled the government to determine where there was a surplus of any product and where a scarcity, and to arrange for periodic distribution so that there would be enough in all the sections of the land. So far as possible, local self-sufficiency was achieved.

A system of such complexity naturally demanded a considerable number of public officers and a high degree of administrative organization. The whole population was hierarchically organized into military-like formations with major departments of ten thousand, subdivided and re-subdivided into units of one thousand, five hundred, one hundred, fifty, and down finally to ten families. The officer at the bottom of the scale, who had supervision of ten families, preserved order among them, saw to it that they discharged their responsibilities to the state, and presented their grievances against the government to those in greater authority.

Judicial matters were handled in the various communities by local magistrates whose jurisdiction covered petty disputes and offenses. The district governor or some other person designated as a superior judge had the responsibility for

trying persons accused of serious crimes. Since there was almost no private property, crimes against property were nearly nonexistent. There was no appeal from the decisions of either local magistrates or superior judges, but it was provided that all decisions should be recorded and forwarded to the capital. Thus the central government officials could keep an eye on the administration of justice throughout the realm, and could correct abuses as they arose. Furthermore, a board of investigators toured the country from time to time to gather first-hand information on the character of the magistrates and their work. In all things the central government seems to have had a sincere interest in the welfare of all the people. In the lack of a written language the vast numbers of census and inventory records were kept on "quipus," or knotted cords.

But by our standards there was a darker side to this picture. Secure though a man might be in subsistence, he had almost no chance to achieve more. When not working his own plot of ground, he labored always at the direction of the government. However, the lack of freedom of the average man in Peru probably was no greater than that of the feudal serf in Japan or Russia or eastern Europe of the same time, where far less concern was exercised for his welfare.

Over the life of the common man in Peru there hung always the shadow of war, but perhaps to no greater degree than before the amalgamation of many tribes into one empire. Like the modern totalitarian chieftains, the Inca took advantage of every opportunity to expand his dominions, and, like them, he made his conquests by political means whenever he could. Propaganda, persuasion, negotiation, bribery—all of these modern techniques of aggrandizement were well understood and regularly employed. If they failed to bring submission, then threats, and finally war itself, followed. And always the Inca was able to back up his threat. Throughout

the land there was a system which amounted to universal military training. Drills were held periodically in each village, and in time of war as many men were conscripted as were needed.

One of the principal reasons for Peruvian military successes was the amazing system of communication. The Incas realized that they must have good roads for the swift movement of troops, and accordingly they built a network of highways joining the various regions. The two most important roads paralleled each other from the northern district to the southern part of the long narrow country, a distance of almost two thousand miles. One ran through the coastal lowlands, the other along the rugged mountain slopes. Each in itself was an impressive engineering achievement. The coastal highway was in large part an embankment raised above the sand, although in some stretches where drifting sand would obliterate any highway huge markers were erected to indicate the way. In the mountains the road builders many times made great cuts through solid rock. They built high fills across ravines and swung suspension bridges across rivers and canyons.

Along these roads every five miles or so was a post-house at which were stationed couriers, who ran their assigned five-mile stretches with great speed, passing on their messages to other couriers, and so on until a dispatch should reach its final destination. Thus a call to arms and other military information could be quickly transmitted by courier throughout the land.

The care of troops on the march was well provided for. At suitable intervals along the roads were permanent barracks, military warehouses, and food depots. With such thoroughness it is not surprising that for centuries the Peruvians were able to meet the formula for victory popularly credited to General Forrest—"to get there fustest with the mostest men."

Whenever expansion of the empire was resisted, the enemy

was plundered and starved into submission, but at every stage of hostilities the Inca held open the possibility of peace. William H. Prescott, in *History of the Conquest of Peru,* quotes one of them as saying, "We must spare our enemies or it will be our loss, since they and all that belongs to them must soon be ours." [7]

When the enemy had submitted, his property was carefully protected, and often the native rulers were left in control of their former subjects. Effective steps were taken to secure their economic and political amalgamation with the rest of the empire. First came the introduction of the conquerors' religion—sun worship. Then, with truly modern efficiency, a survey was made of the conquered territory's resources and a census taken of its population. From this information a program was prepared for dividing the land between individual and state holdings, and soon the entire pattern of Inca economics was applied. Armed garrisons enforced the new order, and meanwhile many young men of the old ruling caste were sent to the Inca capital to be educated to a loyal understanding of the system. Wholesale propaganda was directed at the masses to win popular support. By providing economic security and even-handed justice, the wise government made its conquered people feel that their incorporation into the Empire was not a misfortune.

If there were threats of disloyalty the government met them with calm assurance. Says Prescott:

> When any portion of the recent conquests showed a pertinacious spirit of disaffection, it was not uncommon to cause a part of the population, amounting, it might be, to ten thousand inhabitants or more, to remove to a distant quarter of the kingdom, occupied by ancient vassals of undoubted loyalty to the crown. A like number of these last was transplanted to the territory left vacant by the emigrants. . . . In time, the influence of the well-affected prevailed, supported as they were by royal authority and

by the silent working of the national institutions, to which the strange races became gradually accustomed.[8]

With any conquered group the "silent working of the national institutions" usually proved irresistible. Gradually they became docile and loyal subjects. They were allowed to keep their language for use among themselves and they could even have local affairs managed by their own leaders. They were assured a subsistence. But in the management of the economic life they were subjected to co-ordination with the economy of the empire.

By combining ruthlessness in conquest with justice and administrative skill in dealing with conquered peoples the Incas were able to weld together a vast territory. Out of diversity of skills and local resources they created higher standards of living and evidences of a great and expanding civilization.

The dictatorship of the Incas was far-reaching. No citizen could change his residence or even be married without royal permission. But this dictatorship was exercised with great mildness, good will, and concern for the general welfare, with the result that the people were contented and the government was popular. Means declares:

> ... however stern the Incaic rule may have been, it was never unjust; however much the greatness and splendor of the highly placed may have been served and enhanced, the well-being of the humble was never lost to sight; however much may have been demanded of the people in the way of personal labor and of tribute, society as a whole was well compensated by the measure of peace and security, of plenty and of leisure, that was assured to it by the Incaic rule.[9]

Prescott has also testified, as in the following statement, to the generally beneficent character of the social organization:

The law was constantly directed to enforce a steady industry and a sober management of his affairs. No mendicant was tolerated in Peru. When a man was reduced by poverty or misfortune (it could hardly be by fault), the arm of the law was stretched out to minister relief; not the stinted relief of private charity, nor that which is doled out, drop by drop, as it were, from the frozen reservoirs of "the parish," but in generous measure, bringing no humiliation to the object of it, and placing him on a level with the rest of his countrymen.

... their manifold provisions against poverty ... were so perfect that in their wide extent of territory—much of it smitten with the curse of barrenness—no man, however humble, suffered for the want of food and clothing. Famine, so common a scourge in every other American nation, so common at that period in every country of civilized Europe, was an evil unknown in the dominions of the Incas.

The most enlightened of the Spaniards who first visited Peru, struck with the general appearance of plenty and prosperity, and with the astonishing order with which everything throughout the country was regulated, are loud in their expressions of admiration. No better government, in their opinion, could have been devised for the people.[10]

Spaniards of the conquest era would not have objected to features of the Inca systems which to people of a later day would seem tyrannous. Absolutism still held the field throughout much of Europe and Asia. The Peruvians had not learned how to apply democratic techniques to the government of a national state, but in that respect they were not greatly different from the nations of allegedly more advanced civilization. And in the satisfaction of the material needs of all the people they were certainly far more successful. We can well believe that the thoughtful European contemporaries who knew of the Inca system would have considered it ideal for the people who lived under it.

Several conditions contributed to the sudden downfall of this far-flung empire. It was despotic, and thereby suffered decrease of initiative among the masses of the people. In some respects at least, the sacrifice of democracy which may have seemed necessary for the quick unification of such a vast empire was a source of fatal weakness. The only adjacent population of South America which successfully withstood the pressure of the Incas, and almost the only one which never was subdued by Europeans, was that to the south of Peru, a people which maintained its primitive democracy. The people of Peru had become so used to accepting dictation from above that when strange men, by a curious turn of fate, got control of the Inca, the sole recognized source of public initiative was in foreign hands.

Another developing source of weakness was that while the people practiced monogamy in accordance with ancient democratic usage, the sacred Incas, considered above mere human morality, had of late departed from the ways of their fathers and indulged in many wives. There followed the inevitable jealousy and rivalry of the sons of different mothers. At the time of the Spanish conquest two half-brothers were at open war with each other for possession of supreme power, and the loyalty of the empire was divided.

The nation grew so vast, and with such rapidity, that unity was strained. More important still, all organization was vertical, to and from the Inca. There was little if any connection between officials of equal rank. They did not consult with each other, but reported to superiors. This policy may have prevented sedition and rebellion, but it also prevented the people's working together, except through the Inca. When a little band of Spanish adventurers captured him by perfidy in the guise of friendship, they could through him give orders to the entire Empire. Since the Inca was sacred, none of his subjects dared question his orders, even when he was prisoner. Thus a hundred and fifty adventurers got control of an

empire, though the Inca's army of fifty thousand was close at hand. Had the Inca himself not been captured by supposedly friendly guests, his armies might have withstood the entire Spanish power.

We cannot judge the merit of the ancient Peruvian economy by the fact that the Empire fell before foreigners. The Aztec government of Mexico had a money economy and commerce. It had social classes, with social and economic inequality. It was far more like Europe than Peru. Yet it too fell quickly before a band of Spanish adventurers.

Probably the fundamental cause of the fall of Peru—other than the factor of non-democratic control from the top—was that Peru theretofore had an isolated culture which had lacked occasion to develop effective adaptation to strange influences. This isolation resulted in lack of resistance to common European diseases. As the Spaniards penetrated the country, fatal epidemics of diseases such as measles and chicken pox, to which Europeans were largely resistant, swept ahead of them, bringing not only wholesale death but the feeling of helpless terror.

Europe, Asia, and North Africa had interacted for thousands of years in war and trade and migration, and had developed versatility, sophistication, toughness, and a partial immunity to a great variety of evils. Though ancient Peru, keeping its organization extremely simple and uniform, throve in isolation, it fell quickly before the impact of strange European ways. Its failure seemed more the result of isolation and of its lack of democratic organization than the result of its unique economic organization. Could Peru have had a period of peaceful transition and adjustment to world-wide conditions, its remarkable economy might have survived and might have made a great contribution to civilization. As it is, Peruvian economy seems to have had its greatest influence on the world through the utopias which it inspired.

II

On the Trail of Utopian Sources

MY FIRST INTEREST IN THE SOCIAL ORganization of the Inca civilization of ancient Peru developed during the writing of a biography of Edward Bellamy. Search for possible sources of inspiration for his utopian *Looking Backward* disclosed occasional references by Bellamy and his immediate associates to the empire of the Incas. Careful comparisons led to the conclusion that of all his sources, ancient Peru was perhaps foremost in importance.

From Bellamy's *Looking Backward* the comparison led to More's *Utopia.* The even more striking similarities between Utopia and Peru resulted in the study reported in this and the following chapters.* In order to leave no uncertainty in

* Louis Baudin in his *L'Empire Socialiste des Inka* points out that few utopians have drawn upon Peru. Among these few he mentions Campanella and Morelly, the first of whom, Baudin believes, got his title (*Civitas Solis,* 1630) and possibly certain parts of his system from Peru. However, a careful examination of the text of the "City of the Sun" discloses little or no familiarity with Peru on the part of Campanella, while Campanella states that his City of the Sun is on the island of Taprobane (Ceylon). His utopia suggests more definite acquaintance with Tacitus' *Germania* and Plutarch's *Lycurgus.* Morelly mentions his debt to Peru and includes in his system cultivation in common, public storehouses, and roads "with country dwellings at equal distances along the edge." In his book reviewing, Bellamy indicated familiarity with Morelly.

the matter, it has seemed desirable to add case upon case of parallels between More's *Utopia* and the actual social order of this strange country—which had existed through the centuries unknown to Europe—until doubt as to Thomas More's sources would be no longer tenable.

It is known that shortly after 1514 More went to Flanders on a mission for Henry VIII, and that while there he visited Peter Giles, then secretary to the Municipality of Antwerp. More begins his *Utopia* by stating that while he was in Antwerp Giles introduced him to one Raphael Hythloday, who, he wrote, had sailed on three of the reputed four voyages of Amerigo Vespucci. On the "fourth" of these reputed voyages (to the east coast of South America in 1503), according to More's story, Hythloday left the ship "at the farthest place at which they touched," and with five comrades and an escort of natives traveled overland to Utopia. The episode of the men's being left behind corresponds to the account presumably written by Vespucci.

For four hundred years this introduction to *Utopia* has been thought of as purely fanciful. However, if we treat it as simply a factual account we find a story of great interest. In this chapter we will touch but briefly on the evidence that More could have received direct information from Peru. Yet, because it has been generally supposed that he could not have known of the Incas, the evidence is presented at greater length in an appendix. This of itself is an interesting story of pre-Columbian and early post-Columbian voyages to America, and of three expeditions to Peru from the Atlantic coast, before Pizarro.*

There are several phases of the evidence which support the theory that More's book in the main is not a fictitious story, but a record of a trip to Peru and of what was observed there. In case the particular trip of Vespucci referred to by More had not been made, there were numerous other

* See Appendix, p. 187.

possible sources of information which might have been available for writing *Utopia.* There is strong evidence that several Portuguese voyages, both before and after Columbus, reached the east coast of South America in time to have met the conditions required by More's narrative.

We know now that Peru was first visited, not by Pizzaro on his trip down the west coast of South America, but from the Atlantic coast of what is now central or southern Brazil, and the route taken by the first historically recorded expedition is nearly the same, so far as brief descriptions indicate, as that taken by Thomas More's character Raphael Hythloday on his visit to Utopia.

More's description of the life and social system of Utopia corresponds in the main so closely with ancient Peru, both in major features and in small incidental details, that accidental coincidence seems to be out of the question. The statement in *Utopia* that Hythloday was not a common sailor, but an educated traveler, would help to account for the close observation and accurate, detailed descriptions of Peruvian life and economy which are found in More's *Utopia.*

More's brief narrative of the trip across country to Utopia fairly accurately conforms to what so short an account might be of the part of southern Brazil over which his traveler would have passed. The account in *Utopia* tells us that "after many days' journey they came to towns and cities, and to commonwealths, that were both happily governed and well peopled. Under the equator, and as far on both sides as the sun moves, there lay vast deserts that were parched with the perpetual heat of the sun," etc. If "Hythloday" had come along a Guarani Indian trade route to the region of Lake Titicaca, that is about the kind of country he would have found. The description would be accurate for ancient Peru so far as lands under and to the south of the equator are concerned.

On reaching Utopia, "The first vessels they saw were flat-

bottomed, their sails were made of reeds and wicker woven close together, only some were made of leather." This is a very good description of the curious and unusual craft used then—and now—on Lake Titicaca. More continues, "but afterward they found ships with round keels and canvas sails, in all respects like our ships." The Peruvian balsa rafts on the Pacific did have cabins and canvas sails. They had keels, but not after the style of European vessels. (These balsa rafts are described more fully in Chapter IV.)

This narrative seems the more probably a factual account in the light of what we now know of the first acquaintance of Europeans with the Inca Empire. Any explorer reaching the east coast of South America and communicating with the natives almost certainly would have heard of that fabulous kingdom. Before Columbus' first voyage there were well traveled trade routes from the Atlantic coast to the land of the Incas. Gold and silver work from Peru had reached the Atlantic coast. Eastern Indians had gone to the land of the Incas, while in one case at least it seems that one of the Inca people visited a fleet which returned to Europe two years before More wrote *Utopia.* Chickens, imported to the eastern coast of South America by Europeans, had been passed across the continent by traders to Peru before the Inca Empire was discovered from the Pacific. A suggestion that Vespucci heard of the Incas on his long voyage in 1502 is supplied in the account of his trip which is accepted as authentic: "The people of the country talk about gold and other metals and drugs and many miracles, but I am from St. Thomas, and time will tell all."

Philip Ainsworth Means, in his book *The Spanish Main,* tells how in 1515 and 1516 Dias de Solis, cruising along the coast of Brazil, probably picked up rumors of the golden kingdom. After the death of de Solis a few survivors of his voyage, on an island off the Brazilian coast, heard stories of the great potentate far away, called the "Great White King."

"With amazing courage," Means writes, "this little band of white men, accompanied part of the way by a large number of Indian auxiliaries, made their way westward across immensely difficult country, amid every sort of natural and human peril, until at last they entered what is now south central Bolivia, well within the dominions of the Inca." On the return trip all but two of them were massacred.

In 1525 Sebastian Cabot with two hundred men, supported by merchants of Spain, Italy, and England, stopped on the east coast of Brazil. The ostensible purpose of the expedition was to pass through the Straits of Magellan, but actually, it appears, they wished to search for the fabulous kingdom. Means quotes a Spanish authority as of the opinion that Cabot's expedition, at least, was stimulated by rumors of the Inca country which had reached Europe both from Panama and from the coast of Brazil. A party of fifteen went across country from the coast of Brazil to the land of the Incas, and were entertained by Inca officials. Only seven of the party returned alive. The route from the coast of Brazil to Peru taken by both these historic expeditions is approximately the same, within the limits of meager accounts, as that described by Thomas More in *Utopia*. The expedition of Dias de Solis in 1515 and 1516 was undertaken just at the time Thomas More was writing his famous book.

It is interesting that both More's account of "Raphael Hythloday's" trip across country to Utopia, and the old Spanish accounts of the trip of Dias de Solis, mention the expedition's being accompanied part of the way by a large number of Indian auxiliaries. In the case of de Solis, at least, that is recorded history. It creates a strong presumption that the Indians knew where they were going, along a familiar route.

In 1526 four Portuguese, with two thousand Guarani Indians from the coast, left San Vicente (now Santos) in southern Brazil, went to Peru on a raiding party, and returned to

their party in Paraguay with much booty. The commander, Garcia, sent two of his men to Brazil to report. After they left, he and his party, except Garcia's son, were killed by the Indians.[1] During the past century there was discovered in the archives of the Fugger family a record of a voyage to the eastern coast of South America, with the return to Europe in 1514, bringing quite specific information about the wealth of Peru.

In support of the theory that several voyages were made from Portugal to the east coast of South America, on one of which More's informant might have been present, there is considerable historical evidence, which is discussed in the Appendix.

Not only is the organization of society presented by More in *Utopia* substantially identical with that of ancient Peru, but in curious, incidental ways which have nothing to do with the essential character of an ideal society the description of Utopia corresponds to the facts about the ancient empire of the Incas.

As already suggested, our chief present-day interest in the likeness of the country of Utopia to ancient Peru is in the fact that the elements of a social and economic order which ever since Thomas More's day have been dismissed as "utopian," meaning impracticable of attainment, did in fact exist and prosper for centuries, and for part of that time over a great domain. Other valid criticisms of Bellamy's and More's utopias there may be, but inherent impossibility would seem, judging by Peru, not to be one of them. Let us now turn to an examination of the social organization in Peru, in *Utopia*, and in *Looking Backward*.

In Peru, in *Utopia*, and in *Looking Backward*, the basic economic organization is the same. It is what Thomas More speaks of in *Utopia* as "*the foundation of all the rest, their living in common, without the use of money.*" The Peruvian

system, like the system described by More, was greatly different from that of Europe or Asia. As already stated, there was no money, and almost no private trading except local exchange of surplus local goods such as were produced for home consumption. All production, except for family or local needs, was in the hands of the central government. All goods, except food and clothing produced by each family for its own use or perhaps for purely local exchange, were gathered into warehouses and then distributed as needed, "without money and without price." Except for the small hereditary ruling class, and perhaps for local officials, there was equality in distribution. This fundamental economic structure, which existed nowhere in Europe, is used as to its principal and controlling feature both in *Utopia* and in *Looking Backward.* Quotations from those two books and from Prescott's *Conquest of Peru* will illustrate.

OWNERSHIP OF LAND

Private ownership of land is eliminated. In Peru, after provision was made for the government and the priests, according to Prescott:

> The remainder of the lands was divided, *per capita,* in equal shares among the people.
>
> . . . not only did the lease, if we may so call it, terminate with the year, but during that period the tenant had no power to alienate or to add to his possessions.
>
> A more thorough and effectual agrarian law than this cannot be imagined.
>
> All the mines in the kingdom belonged to the Inca.[2]

When a man married:

> . . . the community or district in which he lived furnished him with a dwelling. . . . A lot of land was then assigned to him sufficient for his own maintenance and that of his wife.[3]

Note the similarity of the account in Utopia:

. . . the people consider themselves rather as tenants than landlords. They have built over all the country, farmhouses for husbandmen, which are well contrived, and are furnished with all things necessary for country labor." [4]

In Bellamy's ideal society farm land is publicly owned and operated, although:

Every one, of course, has his own house and piece of land if he or she desires them . . . but these are allotments for use only, and, being always equal, can furnish no ground for dissension.[5]

PUBLIC WORK AND LABOR ROTATION

Both More and Bellamy follow Peru in providing for public work and for rotation of labor on the land and elsewhere. According to Prescott:

By this constant rotation of labour it was intended that no one should be overburdened, and that each man should have time to provide for the demands of his own household. It was impossible—in the judgment of a high Spanish authority—to improve on the system of distribution, so carefully was it accommodated to the condition and comfort of the artisan.[6]

Means discusses the same subject:

Every craftsman who labored in the service of the Inca or of his Curaca [local supervisor] must be provided with all the raw materials for his labor, so that his contribution consisted only of his time, work, and dexterity. His employment in this way was not to be more than two or three months in the year. [That is not a much greater portion of the year's work than an American contributes to his government through taxes.]

A craftsman was to be supplied with food, clothes, and medicine at need while he was working. . . .

The surplus of the tribute, after the royal wants had been satisfied, were placed on deposit and drawn upon for the good of the people as required.

In special cases tribute was paid in the form of work upon the roads, upon the temples, palaces, aqueducts, bridges, storehouses, or other public works. In other cases the tribute-payers were called upon to serve as *chasqui-cuna* (post runners) or as litter-bearers or as miners.

"...each man had very light work, because their turns were regulated with great exactness, and one never had more to do than another." [Father Blas Valera] I think my readers will agree with me that the world has never seen a code of laws more exquisitely logical nor more sublimely just.[7]

The description of labor rotation in More's *Utopia* is as follows:

Inhabitants are sent by turns from the cities to dwell in [the houses built for farmers]...Every year twenty of this family come back to the town, after they have stayed two years in the country; and in their room there are other twenty sent from the town, that they may learn country work from those that have been already one year in the country, as they must teach those that come to them the next from the town. By this means such as dwell in those country farms are never ignorant of agriculture... But though there is every year such a shifting of the husbandmen, to prevent any man being forced against his will to follow that hard course of life too long; yet many among them take such pleasure in it, that they desire leave to continue in it many years.[8]

Bellamy's program, though less regimented, and more flexible, is to the same effect. Referring in *Equality* to "the isolation, the loneliness, the lack of social intercourse and opportunity of social culture which were incident to the farmer's life" under the old regime, he says of the citizen under the new order:

"He, like the others, lives where he pleases . . . Work on a farm no longer implies life on a farm, unless for those who like it . . . It is not uncommon on a few days' notice to throw a hundred thousand extra workers into a region where there is a special temporary demand for [farm] labor." [9]

CENSUS AND INVENTORY

In order for the Inca to plan production and to apportion distribution it was necessary to have a periodical census and inventory. In this respect, too, both More and Bellamy follow the Peruvian practice. According to Prescott, the Incas had achieved statistical records of production and consumption which were far beyond those of any European or Asiatic government. He says:

> The nature and amount of the services required were all determined at Cuzco [the capital of the empire] by commissioners well instructed in the resources of the country and in the character of the inhabitants of different provinces.
>
> This information was obtained by an admirable regulation, which has scarcely a counterpart in the annals of a semi-civilised people. A register was kept of all the births and deaths throughout the country, and exact returns of the actual population were made to the government every year . . . At certain intervals, also, a general survey of the country was made, exhibiting a complete view of the character of the soil, its fertility, the nature of its products, both agricultural and mineral,—in short, of all that constituted the physical resources of the empire. Furnished with these statistical details, it was easy for the government, after determining the amount of requisitions, to distribute the work among the respective provinces best qualified to execute it.
>
> An inventory of the various products of the country, and the quarters whence they were obtained, was every year taken by the royal officers, and recorded by the *quipu-camayus* on their registers, with surprising regularity and precision. These registers were

transmitted to the capital and submitted to the Inca, who could thus at a glance, as it were, embrace the whole results of the national industry and see how far they corresponded with the requisitions of the government.

The quantity of the cloth needed, as well as the peculiar kind and quality of the fabric, was first determined at Cuzco. The work was then apportioned among the different provinces. Officers appointed for the purpose superintended the distribution of the wool, so that the manufacture of the different articles should be intrusted to the most competent hands.

The like course was pursued with reference to the other requisitions of the government . . . the labour of a larger number of hands was exacted for the execution of the great public works which covered the land.[10]

Means refers to:

. . . the system of statistics which provided the ruler with exact information concerning the material wealth, the value, existent in each district, and also concerning the man-power therein . . . The Incas had to depend upon the *quipu* for the preservation of their records. . . . By means of the *quipu* the *quipu-camayoc*, knot-record keeper, could enumerate and calculate in the decimal system. In this respect the Incas were far ahead of the Romans, with their clumsy system of figures, and even of the modern British, with their absurd £.s.d. . . . "These [quipus] were long ropes made of knotted cords, and those who were accountants and understood the arrangement of these knots, could, by their means, give an account of the expenditure, and of other things during a long course of years." [Cieza][11]

More's *Utopia* covers this subject as follows:

In their great council at Amaurot [Cuzco of Peru?], to which there are three sent from every town once a year, they examine what towns abound in provisions, and what are under any scarcity, that so the one may be furnished from the other; and this is

done freely, without any sort of exchange; for according to their plenty or scarcity, they supply, or are supplied from one another; so that indeed the whole island is, as it were, one family. When they have thus taken care of their whole country, and laid up stores for two years, which they do to prevent the ill consequences of an unfavorable season, they order an exportation of the overplus . . . [12]

In *Looking Backward* we find provision for similar statistical controls.

SYSTEM OF STOREHOUSES

In the direct economy of ancient Peru, wealth did not consist of stocks and bonds or tokens, but of things themselves and of improved lands and production facilities. To smooth out irregularities of nature and men, a system of storehouses was necessary. Prescott makes several references to this remarkable system:

At the appointed season they [the llamas in the public flocks] were well sheared, and the wool was deposited in the public magazines.

A part of the agricultural produce and manufactures was transported to Cuzco, to minister to the immediate demands of the Inca and his court. But far the greater part was stored in magazines scattered over the different provinces. These spacious buildings, constructed of stone, were divided between the Sun and the Inca, though the greater share seems to have been appropriated by the monarch. By a wise regulation, any deficiency in the contributions of the Inca might be supplied from the granaries of the Sun. But such a necessity could rarely have happened; and the providence of the government usually left a large surplus in the royal depositories, which was removed to a third class of magazines, whose design was to supply the people in seasons of scarcity, and, occasionally, to furnish relief to individuals whom

sickness or misfortune had reduced to poverty; thus in a manner justifying the assertion of a Castilian document, that a large portion of the revenues of the Inca found its way back again, through one channel or another, into the hands of the people. These magazines were found by the Spaniards, on their arrival, stored with all the various products and manufactures of the country,—with maize, *coca quinua*, woollen and cotton stuffs of the finest quality, with vases and utensils of gold, silver and copper, in short, with every article of luxury or use within the compass of Peruvian skill. The magazines of grain, in particular, would frequently have sufficed for the consumption of the adjoining district for several years.[13]

The description in *Utopia* is brief, but specific:

Every city is divided into four equal parts, and in the middle of each there is a market place: what is brought thither, and manufactured by the several families, is carried from thence to houses appointed for that purpose, in which all things of a sort are laid by themselves . . .[14]

In *Looking Backward* we find similar provisions:

"All our [retail] stores are sample stores, except as to a few classes of articles. The goods, with these exceptions, are all at the great central warehouse of the city, to which they are shipped directly from the producers. We order from the sample . . . The orders are sent to the warehouse, and the goods distributed from there."[15]

A MONEYLESS ECONOMY

An economy without money, and without buying or selling except for local exchange of surplus local goods, seems strange to Europeans or Americans, but the great Peruvian empire throve on such a system. Means gives his judgment of the nature of their commerce:

The commerce of the nation, as I see it in the light of the evidence adduced, was chiefly a local matter conducted under governmental supervision at the various grades of fairs or markets, supplemented by long-distance traffic which was wholly in the hands of the imperial authorities.[16]

He indicates further:

...they were able to build public works which no modern society, always governed in its enterprises by the monetary factor, could hope to accomplish in those regions with financial profit... By means of these beneficial public works the Incas increased the yield of their realm tremendously and built up for themselves a renown which has never faded away.[17]

According to Prescott:

Under this extraordinary polity, a people advanced in many of the social refinements, well skilled in manufactures and agriculture, were unacquainted, as we have seen, with money. They had nothing that deserved to be called property.[18]

The account in *Utopia* has a strangely similar sound. Not only did More speak of this moneyless economy as being "the foundation of all the rest," but he went into details:

...they [the Utopians] sow much more, and breed more cattle than are necessary for their consumption; and they give that overplus of which they make no use to their neighbors. When they want anything in the country which it does not produce, they fetch that from the town, without carrying anything in exchange for it.

...there being no property among them, every man may freely enter into any house whatsoever.

...every father goes and takes whatsoever he or his family stand in need of, without either paying for it, or leaving anything in exchange.

In all other places it is visible, that while people talk of a commonwealth, every man only seeks his own wealth; but there,

where no man has any property, all men zealously pursue the good of the public; and, indeed, it is no wonder to see men act so differently; for in other commonwealths every man knows that unless he provides for himself, how flourishing soever the commonwealth may be, he must die of hunger; so that he sees the necessity of preferring his own concerns to the public; but in Utopia, where every man has a right to everything, they all know that if care is taken to keep the public stores full, no private man can want anything . . .[19]

Bellamy, too, outlines an identical moneyless state:

". . . as soon as the nation became the sole producer of all sorts of commodities, there was no need of exchanges between individuals that they might get what they required. Everything was procurable from one source, and nothing could be procured anywhere else. A system of direct distribution from the national storehouses took the place of trade, and for this money was unnecessary." [20]

ORGANIZATION OF THE POPULATION

For this moneyless economy to be successful, it was necessary that all those able to do so should work. According to Markham and to Means, the entire Inca population was divided into ten classes, from infancy to old age.* The first five classes, from birth to sixteen years old, were not required to work. From sixteen to twenty they did light manual work, such as coca picking, and from twenty to twenty-five they helped their elders at their tasks. The *puric*, or able-bodied man from twenty-five to fifty, was head of a house-

* Robert Owen's utopian writings, dating from twenty years before Prescott's *Conquest of Peru*, also recapitulated Peruvian economy in important respects. In his classification of the population into age groups, he went further in the direction of Peru than did Thomas More. Where, except in *Utopia*, did he find his pattern? Various descriptions of Peruvian economy translated into English were accessible to him.

hold and payer of tribute; from fifty to sixty he was "half old," doing light work; the tenth grade, that of *puñuc-rucu*, or "old men sleeping," made up of those beyond sixty, were free from work.[21]

More covers the same ground in *Utopia:*

. . . in a great city, and in all the territory that lies round it, you can scarce find five hundred, either men or women, [who] by their age and strength, are capable of labor, that are not engaged in it; even the Syphogrants, though excused by the law, yet do not excuse themselves, but work, that by their examples they may incite the industry of the rest of the people.[22]

On the matter of universal obligation to work, Bellamy leaves no doubt whatsoever:

". . . to speak of service being compulsory would be a weak way to state its absolute inevitableness. Our entire social order is so wholly based upon and deduced from it that if it were conceivable that a man could escape it, he would be left with no possible way to provide for his existence." [23]

SUPERVISION OF LABOR

This universal labor required a program of supervision, and this, too, is common to Peru, *Utopia*, and *Looking Backward*. Prescott describes the process:

The task of apportioning the labour was assigned to the local authorities, and great care was taken that it should be done in such a manner that, while the most competent hands were selected, the weight should not fall disproportionately on any.

The people were not allowed to be employed on works pernicious to their health, nor to pine—a sad contrast to their subsequent destiny—under the imposition of tasks too heavy for their powers. They were never made the victims of public or private extortions; and a benevolent forecast watched carefully over their necessities, and provided for their relief in seasons of infirmity and

for their sustenance in health. The *government of the Incas, however arbitrary in form, was in its spirit truly patriarchal.*[24]

Utopia provides similarly for labor supervision:

The chief, and almost the only business of the syphogrants, is to take care that no man may live idle, but that every one may follow his trade diligently; yet they do not wear themselves out with perpetual toil, from morning to night, as if they were beasts of burden...[25]

The idea of supervision of labor runs through Bellamy's two books, *Looking Backward* and *Equality*, and no brief quotation is adequate. The following from *Looking Backward* is an example of the genius of Bellamy in realizing the greatest degree of regulation with the least degree of regi mentation:

"It is the business of the administration to seek constantly to equalize the attractions of the trades... This is done by making the hours of labor in different trades to differ according to their arduousness. The lighter trades, prosecuted under the most agreeable circumstances, have in this way the longest hours, while an arduous trade, such as mining, has very short hours.... The administration... simply follows the fluctuations of opinion among the workers themselves as indicated by the rate of volunteering. The principle is that no man's work ought to be, on the whole, harder for him than any other man's for him, the workers themselves to be the judges...." [26]

The problem of supervision of the "industrial army" is a major issue with Bellamy, and on the whole was skillfully handled.

HOURS OF WORK

This vast program made possible limitations of hours of work. Prescott says:

. . . no one was required to give more than a stipulated portion of his time to the public service. He was then succeeded by another for the like term; and it should be observed that all who were engaged in the employment of the government—and the remark applies equally to agricultural labour—were maintained, for the time, at the public expense.

The security of the working-classes seems to have been ever kept in view in the regulations of the government; and these were so discreetly arranged that the most wearing and unwholesome labours, as those of the mines, occasioned no detriment to the health of the labourer; a striking contract to his subsequent condition under which the Spanish rule.[27]

The story is repeated in *Utopia:*

. . . it frequently happens, that for want of other work, vast numbers are sent out to mend the highways. But when no public undertaking is to be performed, the hours of working are lessened. The magistrates never engage the people in unnecessary labor, since the chief end of the constitution is to regulate labor by the necessities of the public, and to allow all the people as much time as is necessary for the improvement of their minds, in which they think the happiness of life consists.

. . . they, dividing the day and night into twenty-four hours, appoint six of these for work; three of which are before dinner; and three after.[28]

With technological developments pictured in *Looking Backward,* Bellamy could forecast even shorter working hours.

DIGNITY OF LABOR

Labor was honorable in Peru. Means, in his *Ancient Civilizations of the Andes,* emphasizes this principle:

The dignified position held by manual labor in the Incaic polity is made apparent by the fact that everyone, from the Inca downwards, participated in it . . . Garcilaso . . . tells us that . . . the terrace called Collcampata . . . "was cultivated by persons of the blood royal, and none but Incas and Pallas (Ladies) could work on it." [29]

So it was also in *Utopia:*

. . . if there is anywhere a rough, hard, and sordid piece of work to be done . . . they cheerfully, and of their own accord, take that to their share . . . but by their stooping to such servile employments, they are so far from being despised, that they are so much the more esteemed by the whole nation.[30]

With this attitude Bellamy is in complete accord:

". . . it is an axiom of ethics that to accept a service from another which we would be unwilling to return in kind, if need were, is like borrowing with the intention of not repaying, while to enforce such a service by taking advantage of the poverty or necessity of a person would be an outrage like forcible robbery. It is the worst thing about any system which divides men, or allows them to be divided, into classes and castes, that it weakens the sense of a common humanity.

". . . there is recognized no sort of difference between the dignity of the different sorts of work required by the nation." [31]

TRADES AND HANDICRAFTS

In the matter of handicrafts, Prescott relates:

The natives showed a skill in other mechanical arts similar to that displayed by their manufactures of cloth. Every man in Peru was expected to be acquainted with the various handicrafts essential to domestic comfort.

. . . the wool was deposited in the public magazines. It was then dealt out to each family in such quantities as sufficed for its

wants, and was consigned to the female part of the household, who were well instructed in the business of spinning and weaving.[32]

On the same point More says of "Utopia":

... every man has some peculiar trade to which he applies himself, such as the manufacture of wool, or flax, masonry, smith's work, or carpenter's work... Every family makes their own clothes; but all among them, women as well as men, learn one or other of the trades formerly mentioned. Women, for the most part, deal in wool and flax, which suit best with their weakness, leaving the ruder trades to the men.[33]

In each case these callings were hereditary. Prescott says:

The different provinces of the country furnished persons peculiarly suited to different employments, which, as we shall see hereafter, usually descended from father to son.[34]

More in *Utopia* treats of the same point as follows:

The same trade generally passes down from father to son, inclinations often following descent; but if any man's genius lies another way, he is by adoption translated into a family that deals in the trade to which he is inclined...[35]

AN ECONOMY OF ABUNDANCE

The effect of the Peruvian economy was a universal abundance, on the very simple scale of living which prevailed. Growing out of that equality and security there is pictured a fading away of greed and avarice. According to Prescott:

No man could be rich, no man could be poor, in Peru; but all might enjoy, and did enjoy, a competence. Ambition, avarice, the love of change, the morbid spirit of discontent, those passions which most agitate the minds of men, found no place in the bosom of the Peruvian.[36]

Means, in his *Fall of the Inca Empire*, supports this view. He says:

The empire ruled by this most rational of systems was one whose people were as fortunate, in a material way at least, as any who have ever lived. If laws were severe, the people suffered but little from that severity because the laws were seldom flouted; if all, high and low, had to work in appropriate manners for the good of the state, all alike received recompense in the form of security against want of all kinds. Money was unknown, and so also were the myriad evils—avarice, corruption, cruelty, and oppression—which follow in its train . . .[37]

It would seem that More was describing this economy when he wrote in *Utopia:*

. . . among them there is no unequal distribution, so that no man is poor, none in necessity; and though no man has anything, yet they are all rich; for what can make a man so rich as to lead a serene and cheerful life, free from anxieties . . .

There is no reason for giving a denial to any person, since there is such plenty of everything among them; and there is no danger of a man's asking for more than he needs; they have no inducements to do this, since they are sure that they shall always be supplied. It is the fear of want that makes any of the whole race of animals either greedy or ravenous; but besides fear, there is in a man a pride that makes him fancy it a particular glory to excel others in pomp and excess. But by the laws of the Utopians there is no room for this.

. . . the use as well as the desire of money being extinguished, much anxiety and great occasions of mischief are cut off with them. And who does not see that the frauds, thefts, robberies, quarrels, tumults, contentions, seditions, murders, treacheries, and witchcrafts, which are indeed rather punished than restrained by the severities of law, would all fall off, if money were not any more valued by the world? Men's fears, solicitudes, cares, labors,

and watchings would all perish in the same moment with the value of money: even poverty itself, for the relief of which money seems most necessary, would fall.[38]

The entire program of Bellamy is based upon the feasibility of an economy of abundance. As a typical expression, he wrote in *Looking Backward:*

"No man any more has any care for the morrow, either for himself or his children, for the nation guarantees the nurture, education, and comfortable maintenance of every citizen from the cradle to the grave.[39]

With modern labor-saving technology, that seems a far more reasonable forecast than did the prophecy of More in his day, and it would be far less like a miracle than the actual achievement of the Incas. Bellamy also believed that absence of acute want would reduce the tendency to crime. He says:

"Directly or indirectly, the desire for money, which then meant every good thing, was the motive of all this crime, the taproot of a vast poison growth . . . When we made the nation the sole trustee of the wealth of the people, and guaranteed to all abundant maintenance, on the one hand abolishing want, and on the other checking the accumulation of riches, we cut this root, and the poison tree that overshadowed your society withered . . ." [40]

AGRICULTURE

With regard to agriculture there is a very striking degree of similarity between Peru and *Utopia*, and to some extent between these and *Looking Backward.* A description of Inca agriculture is interesting in that it shows clearly that the universal well-being which the country enjoyed was not due to prodigal favors of nature, but was largely won from barren deserts and steep rugged mountains by wise planning and highly efficient administration of vast public works. It is

striking evidence of the practical effectiveness of the kind of social economy described by More and Bellamy, and as practiced in Peru. Prescott's description of how natural difficulties were overcome is impressive:

> The face of the country would appear to be peculiarly unfavourable to the purposes both of agriculture and of internal communication. The sandy strip along the coast, where rain rarely falls, is fed only by a few scanty streams... The precipitous steeps of the sierra, with its splintered sides of porphyry and granite, and its higher regions wrapped in snows that never melt... might seem equally unpropitious to the labours of the husbandman.
>
> The soil, it is true, was for the most part sandy and sterile; but many places... needed only to be properly irrigated to be susceptible of extraordinary production. To these spots water was conveyed by means of canals and subterraneous aqueducts executed on a noble scale.... Some of these aqueducts were of great length. One... measured between four and five hundred miles.... In this descent a passage was sometimes to be opened through rocks,—and this without the aid of iron tools; impracticable mountains were to be turned, rivers and marshes to be crossed; in short, the same obstacles were to be encountered as in the construction of their mighty roads.
>
> Many of the hills, though covered with a strong soil, were too precipitous to be tilled. These they cut into terraces, faced with rough stone, diminishing in regular gradation towards the summit; so that, while the lower strip, or *anden*, as it was called by the Spaniards, that belted round the base of the mountain, might comprehend hundreds of acres, the uppermost was only large enough to accommodate a few rows of Indian corn.... With such patient toil did the Peruvians combat the formidable obstacles presented by the face of their country! Without the use of the tools or the machinery familiar to the European, each individual could have done little; but acting in large masses, and

under a common direction, they were enabled by indefatigable perseverance to achieve results to have attempted which might have filled even the European with dismay.

In the same spirit of economical husbandry which redeemed the rocky sierra from the curse of sterility, they dug below the arid soil of the valleys and sought for a stratum where some natural moisture might be found. These excavations, called by the Spaniards *hoyas*, or "pits," were made on a great scale, comprehending frequently more than an acre, sunk to the depth of fifteen or twenty feet, and fenced round within by a wall of *adobes*, or bricks baked in the sun. The bottom of the excavation, well prepared by a rich manure of the sardines,—a small fish obtained in vast quantities along the coast,—was planted with some kind of grain or vegetable.

Under their patient and discriminating culture, every inch of good soil was tasked to its greatest power of production; while the most unpromising spots were compelled to contribute something to the subsistence of the people. Everywhere the land teemed with evidence of agricultural wealth, from the smiling valleys along the coast to the terraced steeps of the sierra, which, rising into pyramids of verdure, glowed with all the splendours of tropical vegetation.[41]

In comparison with these great works, how limited is agricultural mastery of our own broad, fertile, and well-watered acres, aided as it is by steam, electricity, modern machinery, high explosives, and universal transportation and communication. The security and contentment of the Peruvian farmer presents a striking contrast to the insecurity of American agriculture. Here the mortgage hangs over the farm like the sword of Damocles, or the tenant shifts from farm to farm in restless, poverty-bound discontent, or the migrant farm worker roams in near hopelessness from farm to farm and from crop to crop. It would seem that a money economy is not the only way to administer agriculture.

More's *Utopia* in total is but a short essay, and his information at best must have been very incomplete; consequently most subjects are treated briefly. Yet what he does say concerning agriculture is in harmony with Prescott:

> ... though they ... have neither the most fruitful soil nor the purest air in the world, yet ... by their industry they so cultivate their soil, that there is nowhere to be seen a greater increase both of corn and cattle, nor are there anywhere healthier men, and freer from diseases: for one may there see reduced to practice ... all the art that the husbandman employs in manuring and improving an ill soil ...
>
> They cultivate their gardens with great care, so that they have both vines, fruits, herbs, and flowers in them; and all is so well ordered, and so finely kept, that I never saw gardens anywhere that were both so fruitful and so beautiful as theirs.[42]

Both in Peru and in Utopia, everyone, except the small ruling class, was in agriculture. As this was a condition unknown in Europe or Asia, and is not necessary to the economy described in *Utopia*, the likeness is all the more remarkable. Prescott states:

> Every Peruvian of the lower class was a husbandman, and, with the exception of those already specified, was expected to provide for his own support by the cultivation of his land.
>
> Husbandry was pursued by them on principles that may be truly called scientific. It was the basis of their political institutions. Having no foreign commerce, it was agriculture that furnished them with the means of their internal exchanges, their subsistence, and their revenues. We have seen their remarkable provisions for distributing the land in equal shares among the people, while they required every man, except the privileged orders, to assist in its cultivation. The Inca himself did not disdain to set the example. [Later students of Peru are of the opinion that foreign commerce was not entirely lacking.] [43]

Thomas More, in his brief way, covers the same ground:

> Agriculture is that which is so universally understood among them, that no person, either man or woman, is ignorant of it; they are instructed in it from their childhood, partly by what they learn at school, and partly by practice; they being led out often into the fields, about the town, where they not only see others at work, but are likewise exercised in it themselves.[44]

In one respect the Peruvian system had a simplicity and economy which is not envisaged in *Looking Backward*. Since each family raised the greater part of its own food and made most of its own clothes, the national economic system was relieved of the great bulk of the burden of administration and of distribution. Even in a present-day technological economy, a decentralization of population and of industry which would allow a higher degree of local self-support would greatly disencumber and simplify the economic process. In fact, such a decentralization of production as that of Peru may be a necessary condition to the effective working of such a state as that described in *Utopia* or in *Looking Backward*. Bellamy missed this point in his first utopia, but in its sequel, *Equality*, he corrected that oversight. America, whether under a money economy as at present, or under a direct service economy as pictured by Bellamy, might go far toward achieving stability, eliminating waste motion, and reducing want, by realizing more of the possibilities of local and regional self-sufficiency.

FAMILY GROUPS

The fundamental social organization described in *Utopia* is very similar to that outlined by Means in his *Ancient Civilizations of the Andes*. In Utopia "no country family has fewer than forty men and women in it, besides two slaves," governed by a master and a mistress; whereas in the Peruvian

society, though chronicles differ somewhat, it seems clear that there were officials in charge of ten households. In Utopia there was an official over each thirty families. In Peru, according to Means, there were officials in charge of fifty households. In the Peruvian economy there was an ascending scale of family groups with officials in charge of one hundred, five hundred, one thousand, ten thousand, and forty thousand families, with finally four officials, each in charge of a quarter of the empire, with the Inca at the head. What a wonderful training school for administrators this system provided!

COLONIZATION

The Inca habit of adjusting the population to regional resources by colonization is closely approximated in *Utopia.* Means quotes Garcilaso, the greatest of all Peruvian historians, whose mother was an Inca princess:

"In the course of their conquests the Incas found some provinces to be naturally fertile, but thinly populated. To these districts they sent Indians who were natives of other provinces with a similar climate. . . . When the inhabitants of a locality multiplied rapidly, so that their province was not large enough to hold them, they removed a certain proportion of the people to some other district. They also removed Indians from barren and sterile tracts to such as were fertile and prolific. . . . Colonists were also sent to other provinces for a reason of state. . . ." [45]

In *Utopia* we read:

. . . they supply cities that do not increase so fast, from others that breed faster; and if there is any increase over the whole island, then they draw out a number of their citizens out of the several towns, and send them over to the neighboring continent; where, if they find that the inhabitants have more soil than they can well cultivate, they fix a colony, taking the inhabitants into their society, if they are willing to live with them . . .[46]

FEW LAWS

In each case there were few laws. As Prescott states:

The laws were few and exceedingly severe. They related almost wholly to criminal matters. Few other laws were needed by a people who had no money, little trade, and hardly anything that could be called fixed property.

...in a country like Peru, where few but criminal causes were known, the right of appeal was of less consequence. The law was simple, its application easy; and, where the judge was honest, the case was as likely to be determined correctly on the first hearing as on the second.... The law which required a decision within five days would seem little suited to the complex and embarrassing litigation of a modern tribunal. But...the Spaniards, familiar with the evils growing out of long-protracted suits, where the successful litigant is too often a ruined man, are loud in their encomiums of this swift-handed and economical justice.[47]

In *Utopia* we find the following: "They have but few laws, and such is their constitution that they need not many."

Here Bellamy is in agreement:

"With no private property to speak of, no disputes between citizens over business relations, no real estate to divide or debts to collect, there must be absolutely no civil business at all for them; and with no offenses against property, and mighty few of any sort to provide criminal cases, I should think you might almost do without judges and lawyers altogether."

"We do without the lawyers, certainly," was Dr. Leete's reply.

"There is neither private property, beyond personal belongings, now, nor buying and selling, and therefore the occasion of nearly all the legislation formerly necessary has passed away."[48]

III

Non-Utopian Parallels

COMPARISONS OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC organization do not exhaust likenesses between Peru on the one hand and More's *Utopia* on the other. From some of the "un-utopian" aspects of his society there is also evidence that More may have received many of his ideas from a report on the land of the Incas.

There is a price to pay for this high level of economic well-being, and here both More and Bellamy are in partial agreement with the economy of Peru. Prescott writes of the Peruvians, not including the small royal class of officials and priests:

> They could follow no craft, could engage in no labour, no amusement, but such as was specially provided by law. They could not change their residence or their dress without a license from the government. They could not even exercise the freedom which is conceded to the most abject in other countries,—that of selecting their own wives.
>
> The astonishing mechanism of the Peruvian polity could have resulted only from the combined authority of opinion and positive power in the ruler to an extent unprecedented in the history of man. Yet that it should have so successfully gone into operation, and so long endured, in opposition to the taste, the prejudices, and

the very principles of our nature, is a strong proof of a generally wise and temperate administration of the government.[1]

Even these are not the harshest words which Prescott used in describing a social order so different from that of his home state of Massachusetts.

More's picture of Utopia also includes much of regimentation:

> If any man has a mind to visit his friends that live in some other town, or desires to travel and see the rest of the country, he obtains leave very easily from the Syphogrant and Tranibors, when there is no particular occasion for him at home. Such as travel, carry with them a passport from the Prince, which both certifies the license that is granted for traveling, and limits the time of their return . . . if any man goes out of the city to which he belongs, without leave, and is found rambling without a passport, he is severely treated, he is punished as a fugitive, and sent home disgracefully; and if he falls again into the like fault, is condemned to slavery. . . . all men live in full view, so that all are obliged, both to perform their ordinary task and to employ themselves well in their spare hours.[2]

R. W. Chambers, in his scholarly and eulogistic life of Thomas More, emphasizes, apparently with approval, this element of personal subordination in *Utopia.* He says, ". . . the ideal of *Utopia* is discipline, not liberty. It is influenced by some of the most severe disciplines the world has ever known." [3] Again he says of More, "He had been the first modern to draw a picture of the corporate state with its remorseless discipline. In *Utopia* he had reserved to the individual almost nothing, save the integrity of his soul . . ." [4] In another place he says, "If the Utopian attempts to break the laws of his native land, there is the penalty of bondage, and behind that of death. Even to speak of state affairs, except at the licensed place and hour, is punishable in Utopia

with death, lest permission to discuss politics might lead to revolution. Has any State, at any time, carried terrorism quite so far?" [5]

Another of Thomas More's admirers and defenders supports the view that there would be small liberty in Utopia. In *More's Utopia and His Social Teaching*, William Edward Campbell writes:

> The first general impression that comes to us of the Utopian life is that it was one of very severe discipline. Everything is made subservient to the general good, and few of the inhabitants of Utopia rejoice even in a small measure of personal independence.
>
> Each individual Utopian was but a pawn in the hand of the governing powers. A twentieth-century individual prides himself upon his freedom to go wherever he pleases and whenever it pleases him. But in Utopia a man could hardly move more than a few hundred yards without an official leave to do so. Nor, again, could he stay where he was for very long without special permission.[6]

In this respect Campbell's appraisal of *Utopia* corresponds to Prescott's opinion of Peru.

Under the pleasant language we see also the element of regimentation in Bellamy's program:

> "... but a worker may likewise, under suitable regulations and not too frequently, obtain a transfer to an establishment of the same industry in another part of the country which for any reason he may prefer ... It is only the poorest sort of workmen who desire to change even as frequently as our regulations permit." [7]

Miss Emily Balch, the sociologist, writes that when her father read *Looking Backward* at the time of its first publication, he said, "It is slavery, but it's worth it." Bellamy sought to keep open the possibilities of spontaneity and initiative. He was willing to give up some liberty for privileged men in order to insure a degree of economic freedom for all

men. He seems to have borrowed from Peru, but did not blindly imitate.

Various writers have wondered why Thomas More, in writing of an ideal commonwealth, should have included some elements that are sordid, brutal, and unideal. For instance, Lewis Mumford, in his *The Story of Utopias*, says:

> The greater part of the business of the government [of Utopia] relates to the economic life of the people. There are certain other matters, however, which remain over for them; and these affairs constitute a blot on More's conception of the ideal commonwealth. One of them is the regulation of travel; another is the treatment of crime; and a third is war.
>
> While any man may travel if there is no particular occasion for him at home—whether he wishes to visit friends or see the rest of the country—it is necessary for him to carry a passport from the Prince. If he stay in any place longer than a night he must follow his proper occupation; and if anyone goes out of the city without leave or is found wandering around without a passport, he is punished as a fugitive, and upon committing the offense a second time is condemned to slavery. This is a plain example of unimaginative harshness; and it is hard to explain away; indeed, I have no intention to.
>
> Apparently More could not conceive of a perfectly happy commonwealth for the majority of men if they still had to perform certain filthy daily tasks, like the slaughtering of beef; and so he attempts to kill two birds with one stone; he creates a class of slaves, and he fills this class by condemning to it people who have committed venial crimes. In doing this, he overlooks the final objection to slavery in all its forms; namely, that it tends to corrupt the master.
>
> Since we are discussing the conditions that undermine More's commonwealth, we may remark that war, too, remains; the difference being that the Utopians attempt to do by strategy, corruption, and what we should now call propaganda, what less

intelligent people do by sheer force of arms.... Among the just causes of war the Utopians count the seizure of territory, the oppression of foreign merchants, and the denial of access to land to nations capable of cultivating it. They take considerable pains to keep their "best sort of men for their own use at home, so they make use of the worst sort of men for the consumption of war." [8]

It is very interesting to note that every single particular of Utopia mentioned by Mumford as inappropriate to an ideal commonwealth, is descriptive of Peru. Even the peculiar detail that slaves were required to do the butchering corresponds to facts in Peru, in that almost the principal use of slaves, who were descendants of military captives, was to serve in the temples, where many animals were slaughtered as sacrifices. Hunting for sport was outlawed in Peru. Compare all this with More in *Utopia:* "Therefore all this exercise of hunting, as a thing unworthy to be used of free men, the Utopians have rejected to their butchers; to the which craft, as we said before, they appoint their bondmen." Is it not probable that in including these unideal elements More simply was describing the land of the Incas as Hythloday had described it? In that light it is not "hard to explain away."

The peculiar methods by which the Peruvians waged war had little to do with the economic system, and were far from ideal; yet More includes them with great accuracy in his *Utopia.* Prescott, in describing the military campaigns of the Incas, and in comparing Inca and Aztec practices, says:

Very different was the policy pursued by the two races in their military career. The Aztecs, animated by the most ferocious spirit, carried on a war of extermination, signalizing their triumphs by the sacrifice of hecatombs of captives; while the Incas, although they pursued the game of conquest with equal pertinacity, preferred a milder policy, substituting negotiation and intrigue for violence, and dealt with their antagonists so that their future

resources should not be crippled, and that they should come as friends, not as foes, into the bosom of the empire.

In every stage of the war, he [the Inca] was open to propositions for peace; and, although he sought to reduce his enemies by carrying off their harvests and distressing them by famine, he allowed his troops to commit no unnecessary outrage on person or property. "We must spare our enemies," one of the Peruvian princes is quoted as saying, "or it will be our loss, since they and all that belongs to them must soon be ours."

They sought to soften the hearts of the rude tribes around them, and melt them by acts of condescension and kindness. Far from provoking hostilities, they allowed time for the salutary example of their own institutions to work its effect, trusting that their less civilized neighbours would submit to their sceptre, from a conviction of the blessings it would secure to them. When this course failed, they employed other measures, but still of a pacific character, and endeavoured by negotiation, by conciliatory treatment, and by presents to the leading men, to win them over to their dominion. In short, they practised all the arts familiar to the most subtle politician of a civilized land to secure the acquisition of empire. When all these expedients failed, they prepared for war.[9]

Means supports this view. He says:

Garcilaso repeatedly makes it clear that conquered chiefs who finally submitted with good grace, and chiefs of states who came into the empire without resisting the Inca, were continued in office and were fitted into the hierarchy of the Incaic administration, each one taking a rank therein to which his position prior to conquest entitled him. Only contumacious chiefs were cast down and replaced by others of the Inca's appointment or of his viceroy's appointment.[10]

Note how closely More follows this description:

They would be both troubled and ashamed of a bloody victory over their enemies, and think it would be as foolish a purchase as

to buy the most valuable goods at too high a rate. And in no victory do they glory so much as in that which is gained by dexterity and good conduct, without bloodshed.

They very much approve of this way of corrupting their enemies, though it appears to others to be base and cruel; but they look on it as a wise course, to make an end of what would be otherwise a long war, without so much as hazarding one battle to decide it.

If this method does not succeed with them, then they sow seeds of contention among their enemies, and animate the prince's brother, or some of the nobility, to aspire to the crown. If they cannot disunite them by domestic broils, then they engage their neighbors against them, and make them set on foot some old pretensions, which are never wanting to princes when they have occasion for them.[11]

Also, in treatment of conquered peoples we see similar likenesses. According to Prescott:

Their policy towards the conquered forms a contrast no less striking to that pursued by the Aztecs. The Mexican vassals were ground by excessive imposts and military conscriptions. No regard was had to their welfare, and the only limit to oppression was the power of endurance.... [They] were made to feel every hour that they were not part and parcel of the nation, but held only in subjugation as a conquered people. The Incas, on the other hand, admitted their new subjects at once to all the rights enjoyed by the rest of the community and though they made them conform to the established laws and usages of the empire, they watched over their personal security and comfort with a sort of parental solicitude. The motley population, thus bound together by common interest, was animated by a common feeling of loyalty, which gave greater strength and stability to the empire as it became more and more widely extended... The policy of the two nations displayed the principle of fear as contrasted with the principle of love.[12]

More in *Utopia* treats of the same subject:

They never lay their enemies' country waste, nor burn their corn, and even in their marches they take all possible care that neither horse nor foot may tread it down, for they do not know but that they may have use for it themselves. They hurt no man whom they find disarmed, unless he is a spy. When a town is surrendered to them, they take it into their protection: and when they carry a place by storm, they never plunder it, but put those only to the sword that opposed the rendering of it up, and make the rest of the garrison slaves, but for the other inhabitants they do them no hurt; and if any of them had advised a surrender, they give them good rewards out of the estates of those that they condemn, and distribute the rest among their auxiliary troops, but they themselves take no share of the spoil.[13]

The comments on a common language are strikingly similar. Prescott says of Peru:

It was determined . . . to substitute [for regional dialects] one universal language, the *Quichua*,—the language of the court, the capital, and the surrounding country,—the richest and most comprehensive of the South American dialects. Teachers were provided in the towns and villages throughout the land, who were to give instruction to all, even the humblest classes; and it was intimated at the same time that no one should be raised to any office of dignity or profit who was unacquainted with this tongue. . . . while each province retained its peculiar tongue, a beautiful medium of communication was introduced, which enabled the inhabitants of one part of the country to hold intercourse with every other, and the Inca and his deputies to communicate with all. This was the state of things on the arrival of the Spaniards.

Thus naturalized in the remotest provinces, it became enriched by a variety of exotic words and idioms, which, under the influence of the court and of poetic culture, if I may so express myself, was gradually blended, like some finished mosaic made up of coarse and disjointed materials, into one harmonious whole.[14]

More is briefer in his comment:

They have all their learning in their own tongue, which is both a copious and pleasant language, and in which a man can fully express his mind. It runs over a great tract of many countries, but it is not equally pure in all places.

Architectural style may have little to do with the main theme of *Utopia*, yet even here we find Prescott and More in agreement. Says Prescott:

The Peruvian architecture, bearing also the general characteristics of an imperfect state of refinement, had still its peculiar character; and so uniform was that character that the edifices throughout the country seem to have been all cast in the same mould.[15]

Means comments on the city of Cuzco:

The ancient streets . . . are narrow and, on the whole, tolerably straight. Because of the massive, dark-hued masonry unrelieved by windows and having only a few doorways, the streets have a grim aspect . . . [With] the immense stretches of unbroken wall the streets must have been drafty and chilly . . . but impressive nevertheless.[16]

More comments in *Utopia:*

He that knows one of their towns, knows them all, they are so like one another, except where the situation makes some difference.

Their buildings are good, and are so uniform, that a whole side of a street looks like one house.[17]

To consider a very different phase of life, we find that both Peru and Utopia had a limited degree of religious freedom, with worship of Sun, Moon, and Stars, and of lesser gods, but also recognition of one supreme deity. Even some very unusual features are alike. For instance, according to Prescott:

The body of the deceased Inca was skilfully embalmed, and removed to the great temple of the Sun at Cuzco. . . .

They cherished a still stranger illusion in the attentions which they continued to pay to these insensible remains, as if they were instinct with life. . . . On certain festivals, the revered bodies of the sovereigns were brought out with great ceremony . . . and entertainments were provided in the names of their masters . . . the guests partook of the melancholy cheer in the presence of the royal phantom with the same attention to the forms of courtly etiquette as if the living monarch had presided! [18]

The account in *Utopia* includes the following:

They believe it inconsistent with the happiness of departed souls not to be at liberty to be where they will, and do not imagine them capable of the ingratitude of not desiring to see those friends with whom they lived on earth in the strictest bonds of love and kindness; besides they are persuaded that good men after death have these affections and all other good dispositions increased rather than diminished, and therefore conclude that they are still among the living, and observe all they say or do.[19]

There are similar comments concerning their temples. Prescott relates:

. . . the most renowned of the Peruvian temples . . . consisted of a principal building and several chapels and inferior edifices, covering a large extent of ground in the heart of the city . . . and was so finely executed that a Spaniard who saw it in its glory assures us he could call to mind only two edifices in Spain which, for their workmanship, were at all to be compared with it.[20]

Again More is more brief, but in agreement: "They have magnificent temples, that are not only nobly built, but extremely spacious . . ." [21]

The attitude of the Peruvian toward augurs and astrology was similar, though unusual at that time. According to Prescott: "The illusory study of astrology, so captivating to

the unenlightened mind, engaged no share of his attention." [22]

More again is in agreement: "They despise and laugh at auguries, and the other vain and superstitious ways of divination, so much observed among other nations . . ." [23]

In addition to More's incorporation into his *Utopia* of unusual and unideal features similar to those found in Inca society, there is another kind of evidence which would harmonize with the view that in *Utopia* he was describing an actual social order, and was not merely projecting his own views. In describing elements of social organization which did not then exist in any known European or Asiatic country, Thomas More specifically stated that he did not approve of the laws and customs which he described. Why should he cumber his account with unromantic, matter-of-fact descriptions of an economic system which was a figment of his own brain, only to reject important elements of that system? More was not the kind of person to write for entertainment only.

There are three reasonable explanations of his course. One is that he actually favored the doctrines he stated, but did not dare to espouse them publicly for fear of disapproval or persecution. J. H. Lupton, in editing the Latin and the first English edition of *Utopia*, took this view. He held that More wrote as he did "as an easy means, if necessary, of disavowing the serious intent of the whole of the Platonic fiction," and that the fact of no English translation's being made for a generation "would be thought strange, if we did not consider the political circumstances of the time." [24]

Another explanation is that More was passing on information he received from a traveler, and that he told the whole story, including the part he approved and the part he disapproved. This viewpoint is emphasized by the fact that he described various sordid and unlovely aspects of utopian

ways, which in almost every particular correspond to Peruvian customs and laws. One of Thomas More's admirers, William Edward Campbell, in his *More's Utopia and His Social Teaching* holds specifically that More repudiated the major doctrine he went to such length to describe. Quoting from *Utopia* a dialogue between More and the traveler Hythloday, Campbell writes:

> [Hythloday] having once again reasserted his principal contention "that until private property is taken away there can be no equitable or just distribution of things... nor can the world be happily governed," he listens to what More has to say in reply.
>
> The reply is one of direct disagreement. "On the contrary," says More, "it seems to me that men *cannot* live conveniently where all things are held in common."
>
> And he continues, "How can there be sufficiency of goods, or anything, where every man will withdraw his hand from labour." [25]

If More were passing on the description of a traveler, of a system he had heard about but did not himself approve, then this explanation would seem to be reasonable.

A third explanation is that he was describing and then refuting Plato, who is mentioned. Yet the likeness to Peru is much greater than the likeness to *The Republic.*

Do not the likenesses of Peru and *Utopia,* in incidental matters which have nothing to do with an ideal society, strongly reinforce the probability that Peru was the chief source of More's account?

The history of ancient Peru, as recorded by Spanish conquerors and as carefully reconstructed by painstaking research during the past century, leaves no doubt that a moneyless, propertyless economy, without wages or buying or selling, is not utopian in the sense of being "contrary to human nature," and therefore impossible, for this economy actually did op-

erate successfully throughout a great empire and for a longer period than our nation has existed, while under that economy a people of many millions achieved an astonishing degree of social security.

The Peruvian social system should not be pictured as faultless. How much of the arbitrary policy of the Incas was due to effort quickly to convert savage and possibly indolent tribes into an orderly and civilized nation; how much was due to the technical primitiveness already described; and how much to the possible fact that only in dictatorship could such a high degree of discipline be achieved—these remain open questions.

The Peruvian standard of living must not be judged by the present age of technology. Means quotes another student of Peru, Louis Baudin, as saying, "In Peru the needs of the populace were few, and the Incas had a genius for preventing them from growing." [26] The very simple life, for high and low, was good public policy where there was neither machine power, nor animal power beyond the llamas that would carry scarcely more than a man. Security for all through long periods was better than intermittent affluence and famine.

Clements R. Markham, long president of the Hakluyt Society, in the course of fifty years' study of Peru, during which time he explored the country, learned the Inca language, translated records, and searched the archives and libraries of Peru and of Europe for documents, at the beginning of this century was perhaps the foremost authority on the Incas. In summing up his life studies in *The Incas of Peru,* he wrote:

> ... it seems certain that, under the very peculiar condition of Peru when the Incas ruled, the dreams of Utopians and Socialists became realities for a time, being the single instance of such realisation in the world's history.
>
> A proof of the general well-being of the people is the large and

increasing population. The *andeneria* or steps of terraced cultivation extending up the sides of the mountains in all parts of Peru, and now abandoned, are silent witnesses of the former prosperity of the country. The people were nourished and well cared for, and they multiplied exceedingly. In the wildest and most inaccessible valleys, in the lofty *punas* surrounded by snowy heights, in the dense forests, and in the sand-girt valleys of the coast, the eye of the central power was ever upon them, and the never-failing brain, beneficent though inexorable, provided for all their wants, gathered in their tribute, and selected their children for the various occupations required by the State, according to their several aptitudes.

This was indeed socialism, such as dreamers in past ages have conceived, and impractical theorists now talk about. It existed once because the essential conditions were combined in a way which is never likely to occur again. These are an inexorable despotism, absolute exemption from outside interference of any kind, a very peculiar and remarkable people in an early stage of civilisation, and an extraordinary combination of skilful statesmanship.

It was destroyed by the Spanish conquest, and the world will never see its like again.[27]

This was written by a man of eighty, thoroughly committed to the prevailing European type of civilization. Along with an historian's rigorous accuracy in finding and recording the facts, did he not have a conservative Englishman's aversion to socialist government?

We have noted that the fundamental social structure of Peru seems to have been an ancient and widespread folkway which had existed among democratically organized tribes throughout South America, as though it had sprung from a single root, long before the tribes began to cohere into great nations. Vespucci and other writers mention similar social organizations among the Indians along the Atlantic coast. Gerard Dudok, the Dutch writer, in his *Thomas More and*

His Utopia holds that More got some of his ideas from Vespucci's meager account of native social customs. More described a far higher culture than Vespucci met, and almost every point mentioned by Vespucci and included in *Utopia* was true, often to a larger degree, of Peru. That structure had continued in the large-scale organizations of Quito and other independent near-by nations before their conquest by the Incas and the completion of the great Inca empire. It did not, therefore, depend solely on an "extraordinary combination of skilful statesmanship." As in many other human societies, the centralized and despotic form of government seems to have been a final phase of a cultural cycle, and not an original characteristic of the Peruvian type of social economy. Philip Ainsworth Means, who, building on the foundation of Prescott's and Markham's researches, made Peru his life work, concluded that in ancient Peru the officials closest to the people, which it would appear constituted the large majority of all the administrative officials of the empire, were chosen by the people they governed.

Under another form of government the descendants of ancient Peru have not shown themselves to be a "peculiar and remarkable people." The European type of society which displaced their own has never recovered the former level of economic or social well-being, and even with the support of modern technology the region sustains far less than the ancient population.

The relative merits of the social order of ancient Peru and the European type of society prevailing there today are suggested by William Vogt, Chief, Conservation Section, Pan American Union. In the *Saturday Evening Post* for May 12, 1945, he wrote:

> Peru once, under the benevolent dictatorship of the Incas, grew wheat on the flanks of the Andes. It developed a system of stone-faced terraces, some of which have lasted to the present day. But,

according to Doctor Bennett, such terracing would now cost about $18,000 an acre....

Ancient Peru fed more people than now live in the country; according to the historians, there was enough for everybody. This was true during hundreds of years and, as one compares ancient terraces with modern soil erosion, one cannot help thinking the ancient Indians had a better chance of survival than their descendants. In modern Peru—as in most of the world—there are many hungry people.[28]

Is not Markham's dictum, "the world will never see its like again," the closest approach a competent historian could make to the conservative, long-held position that it never could happen at all? The real question is not whether it ever can happen again, but rather, whether it is a desirable kind of society to work for, and if not, whether some of its features are worthy of reproduction.

As Emerson, with his everyday Yankee manner, made many Americans into devotees of oriental philosophy without their knowing it, so have not More and Bellamy interested the world in the substance of the unique culture of this strange people? How remarkable that the significance of ancient Peruvian society, under its own name, has not been generally realized by authorities on social organization!

Do not most of the other great human cultures trace back finally to a common root? The unending surges of population over Asia and about the Mediterranean have carried social forms and mechanical skills back and forth until, in the entire region from Japan to Portugal, there is little that is completely separate in its origin.

In South America, in contrast, there existed almost the only great civilization which developed in complete independence of Europe and Asia, a civilization which seems to have grown almost entirely on its own roots. Separated from the main body of mankind so long ago that a great culture

had developed which knew no written language, nor the use of the wheel and axle, the social structure of these people was to Europeans something new under the sun.

POSTSCRIPT

As stated heretofore, inquiry into the possible relation between the organization of society in Peru on the one hand, and *Looking Backward* and *Utopia* on the other, came about through searching Bellamy's writings for all possible hints as to his sources. Once attention was drawn to the likenesses between Peru and *Utopia*, they seemed too obvious to have remained unobserved for four hundred years. A search of the literature disclosed that H. Stanley Jevons had drawn attention to these parallels in a short article in the *London Times Literary Supplement* for November 2, 1935. As I did not see that article until after the foregoing chapter was written, the two suggestions are entirely independent in their origins. Jevons states that so far as he can learn, the similarities had not previously been observed.

He directs attention to "Ideas in *Utopia* which could not have been suggested by the experience of any country other than the Peru of the Incas and were unknown to fiction in More's time." Jevons draws attention to similarities, to some of which I had not alluded. Others I had already described. He says, "The most striking example connecting *Utopia* with the empire of Peru is the ornamentation of the priests' vestments with coloured feathers. . . . The description in *Utopia* is:

" 'The priests wear vestments of various colours of wonderful design, but not as costly material as one would expect; for they are not interwoven with gold or set with precious stones, but wrought with the different feathers of birds so cleverly and skillfully that no costly material could have equalled the value of the design. Moreover, in these birds' wings and

fixed orders by which they are distinguished in the priest's vestment, they say certain hidden mysteries are contained.' "

Jevons continues: "This is almost a description of the elaborate cloaks worn by Incas of the royal family and high officials on state occasions. Several are preserved in museums, and they are almost covered with birds' feathers of various bright colours in striking and varied patterns. . . . the clan and rank of the wearer were indicated in the pattern of the featherwork head dress and possibly also in the cloak. [Approximately the same was true of the Hawaiians, and the pre-Columbian natives of America from the Pueblo Indians of Arizona and New Mexico, and the Tarascans and Aztecs of Mexico, to the Mayans of Yucatan.] "

J. H. Lupton comments on the feather robes, "More's selection of this fanciful apparel for his priests may have been in pure whim, or in the endeavour to find something totally different from existing customs."

He comments also on the fact that in Utopia as in Peru other metals were in use, but that the production of iron was unknown. He mentions the public slaves in Utopia, mainly convicts, which compare with a similar class in Peru. He does not mention that the men serving the Inca's temples were descendants of rebels condemned to death, whose sentence was remitted on request of the Inca's wife.

Jevons comes to the following conclusion: "[More] being a lawyer . . . would hesitate to repeat an extraordinary traveller's tale which he could in no way verify," and would be less subject to criticism by treating it as a fantasy. That More hesitated to associate his reputation with so strange a tale is indicated by the fact elsewhere noted, that he had it published in a foreign country, and in the text indicated his disagreement with major elements of the social order described. The names "Utopia" (nowhere) and "Hythloday" (wise in trifling matters) carried out this pattern of self-protection.

IV

Hythloday, First Circumnavigator?

THOMAS MORE DESCRIBES HYTHLODAY'S return in the following words: "After he, with five Castilians, had traveled over many countries, at last, by strange good fortune, he got to Ceylon, and from thence to Calicut, where he very happily found some Portuguese ships, and beyond all men's expectations, returned to his native country."

Several explanations of this passage are possible. It has generally been taken as pure fantasy on More's part—he was simply making a plausible story. It has been suggested that More still thought South America to be part of Asia, and that therefore his hero could easily reach India. This latter supposition imputes to More an improbable ignorance of current affairs, for by the time he wrote *Utopia* it was generally known that America was a new world, and not a part of the Asiatic continent.

So far as getting back to Spain or Portugal was concerned, there was a well traveled trade route from the Inca Empire north to the Caribbean Sea, at the mouth of the Magdalena River, where Spanish vessels already were not infrequent.

Utopia was published three years before Magellan started on his memorable voyage around the earth, but not until after several Portuguese voyages had been made to India

and back around the Cape of Good Hope. On such voyages it was the almost uniform custom to sail westward from near the Cape Verde Islands to, or near to, Brazil, to take advantage of wind and currents, and then to turn southeasterly to round Africa. Hythloday might have retraced his course from Peru to the Atlantic coast, and there might have caught a Portuguese boat bound for India.

But there is still another possibility. Hythloday might have crossed the Pacific on the balsa craft of the Incas. The ancient Peruvians were not entirely a land-locked people. They constructed large sea-going rafts—balsas—made of seven to eleven or more water-resistant balsawood logs, which are lighter than cork, the larger logs in the center, giving the raft the shape of a pointed ship. They had keels and rudders, and were driven by oars and by canvas sails. One of them would hold fifty men, their supplies, and their llamas. Such an ocean-going craft, laden with a rich cargo, was met on the Pacific high seas by early Spanish explorers.*

At the time of the conquest of Peru by the Spaniards there

* As on other points, the writer found great differences of opinion concerning the seagoing quality of balsa rafts. Kenneth P. Emory, of the Bishop Museum in Honolulu, wrote definitely, "Balsa rafts become waterlogged in a few days if not taken out of the water to dry." Later he wrote that he received this information from the late Roland B. Dixon, and added, "Dixon was so emphatic about it being true that he caused me to modify my opinion that Peruvians may have reached Easter Island bringing the sweet potato and the masonry technique of cutting jogs in stones to make them fit together." (Letters to the author, February 3, 1941, and February 22, 1944.)

The writer then sought information directly from men responsible for the production of balsa timber. William T. Cox, of the U. S. Foreign Economics Administration, on April 15, 1944, informed the author that he had charge of increasing the yield of balsa wood from 6,000,000 to 35,000,000 feet per year. He was given this task because of his previous familiarity with balsa wood. He said, "I have seen balsa logs in floating log booms that had been floating for at least ten years. After long periods in the water they were still as buoyant as pine logs.

were records of a remarkable trip by one of the Incas to rich islands in the far west, across the Pacific. According to Philip Ainsworth Means, two of the greatest historians of ancient Peru, Sarmiento and Cabello de Balboa, record such a trip.

According to Sarmiento's *History of the Incas*, one of the Incas, Tupac Yupanqui, reached the Pacific Ocean in extending his conquests, some time before Columbus' discoveries (the Inca died in 1482). These historians relate that while the Inca was at the city of Tumbez on the Pacific coast, some native merchants returned by sea from the west. They told of islands where there were many people and much gold. The merchants had traveled on the balsa rafts.

The Inca determined to visit these distant lands, and sailed west with an immense fleet of balsas and twenty thousand men. After being gone nine months or a year, he returned with many black-skinned prisoners, gold, a chair of brass, and the skin and jawbone of an animal like a horse—there were no such animals in Peru.

In small floating docks and otherwise they remained floating for a good many years."

Christopher Walker, Chief of the Import and Export Section of the Lumber Division of the War Production Board, also is familiar with balsa in Ecuador and elsewhere. He states that there are three types of balsa wood in Ecuador, the most striking differences being in buoyancy and waterlogging. All three types may be found in a single stand of the timber. The lightest type is most resistant to waterlogging. Workers and their families build shelters on the rafts of balsa being brought down river and live on them for six weeks or more. When logs are left in floating booms, for the first year about three quarters of the log is out of water. After a year about half the log is out of water, and thereafter the buoyancy decreases very slightly. He thought it remarkable that such light porous wood should retain its buoyancy for so long. It is not treated in any way.

Thus, the experts' opinion that ancient Peruvians could not have traveled to the western islands because "balsa craft become waterlogged in a few days if not taken out of the water to dry" does not seem to be well founded.

The trophies were preserved in the fortress at Cuzco until the Spaniards came. The historian Sarmiento adds: "An Inca now living had charge of this skin and jawbone of a horse. He gave this account, and the rest who were present corroborated it." Sarmiento was so impressed by the account and by the trophies that he decided to seek those islands. He set out on an expedition and reached the Galapagos. Various writers have assumed that these were the islands mentioned by Sarmiento and Balboa. However, since the Galapagos Islands had neither human population nor gold, copper, or horses, they doubtless were not the ones reached by the Inca. In William Beebe's book, *Galapagos*, we find the statement: "They are one of the few places on earth where aboriginal man never existed"; and again, "Another feature of the islands is their complete uninhabitableness."

The next islands to the west are the Marquesas, about four thousand miles from Peru. The route from these to the East Indies was fairly well known to the South Sea Islanders. Though it may seem incredible that the Inca could have sailed that far, several bits of information seem to indicate such a possibility. On the Marquesas Islands are remains of great masonry structures, the origin of which is unknown to the present inhabitants.[1] Some of the individual stones weigh from three to ten tons. Concerning them Linton comments: "It is rather surprising to find the structural use of cut stone highly developed among a people otherwise as primitive as the Marquesans. Cut stone was more extensively used in the Marquesas than in any other part of Polynesia for which there are records." Since the Peruvians were past-masters of the art of cutting and transporting massive stone, the possibility that they visited and perhaps colonized the Marquesas Islands supplies one simple explanation.

One of the best pictures we have of the Marquesas Islands as they were before being overrun by white men is in Herman Melville's book *Typee*. In numerous particulars his

account is suggestive both of Peru and of Utopia. He also tells of finding, in 1842, the vestiges of a past civilization, great stone terraces, three hundred feet long by sixty feet wide, built of stones ten to fifteen feet long and five feet thick. He wrote that the dwellings of the Islanders were almost invariably built on massive stone foundations. All over the islands there were other and more massive stone foundations. All these were of great age, and the natives had only vague legends concerning their origin.

According to Melville, religious rites and festivals in the Marquesas, though reflecting an elaborate development, seemed hollow and meaningless, as though they were the empty forms of an earlier culture. He relates that effigies of dead chiefs were kept in the company of the living. This might be an adaptation, in the moist climate of the Marquesas, of the Peruvian custom of similarly treating the mummies of their dead rulers as described in the quotation from Prescott in Chapter III.

The social economy of the Marquesas was very similar to that of ancient Peru. The land was held in common; the catch of fish was equally distributed to the whole population; the community united in building houses for individuals. As in Peru, there were no lawyers, no mortgages, no money. In Peru, in Utopia, and in the Marquesas, the women were exempted from heavy toil, and worked in wool and tappa or cotton. Both in Utopia and in the Marquesas we find a high regard for bodily health and beauty. In Peru, in Utopia, and in the Marquesas, the sick and disabled were fed along with the producers. The habit of reciting their history together in groups was common to all three.

The Marquesas Islands had the sweet potato, a native of America, which, very significantly, had there the same name it bore in Peru. Roland B. Dixon, after a very careful study, was convinced that the introduction of this plant into the

Marquesas and other islands preceded the coming of the Spaniards.[2] Like the Peruvians, the Marquesas Islanders used the "quipu," or strand of knotted cords, for keeping records, though their use of it was much simpler than in Peru.*

* The use of knotted cords for record keeping was not limited to Peru and to the Marquesas, but was almost world-wide. "A Pelew Islander, visiting England, knotted strings as a diary of all that struck him during his visit." (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition, XXII, 762.) "In the Hawaiian Islands native carriers have knotted string records of their rounds." (*Ibid.*) The wampum of the North American Indians was more highly developed. Major Rogers in his *Account of North America* (London, 1765), wrote of its use: "The belts that pass from one nation to another in all treaties, declarations and important transactions are very carefully preserved in the chiefs' cabins, and serve not only as a kind of record or history but as a public treasury.... These strands and belts (of wampum) were the only visible records of the Iroquois, but they required the trained interpreters who could draw from their strings and figures the acts and intentions, locked up in their remembrance."—*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition, XXVIII, 320.

In the sixth century B.C. Lâo Tse, the Chinese philosopher, included in his teaching, "Induce people to return to [the old custom of] knotted cords, and to use them [in the place of writing]."—Chapter 80 of the *Tao-Teh-King* of Lâo Tse (translated by Dr. Paul Carus, Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, 1898), p. 137. In commenting on this passage, Carus states that, "It is mentioned in Herodotus that the Persian King handed a thong with sixty knots to be used as a calendar for two months, to the Ionians whom he appointed guardians of a bridge over the Danube."

We see, therefore, that the use of knotted cords can be no sure indication of intercourse between Peru and lands to the west, though it strongly suggests that possibility. If there had been contact between Peru and Asia, it would seem that it occurred after the art of knotted cords developed, but before the art of writing (or the wheel and axle or the arch in architecture) had reached the eastern coast of Asia. Any later contact must have been casual or relatively recent, such as that of the Tumbez merchants or of the Inca Tupec Yupanqui.

Another suggestion occurs to the writer in considering this primitive

While pioneer travel from the East Indies eastward across the South Seas was by canoe, on some of the Pacific islands south of the Marquesas travel was by ocean-going rafts similar to those used in ancient Peru. Tradition has it that in old days some of these rafts were large enough to carry a thousand persons.

But it is not only in the Marquesas Islands that we have suggestions of Peruvian movements to the west.

While this chapter was in preparation the writer corresponded with Mr. R. Neil Williams, an amateur anthropologist of Bandoeng, Java. Mr. Williams is convinced that some East Indian cultures, as of the Toradjas of Celebes, bear evidence of ancient Peruvian origin or influence. He states: "The Toradjas are ancient émigrés from Peru, with textiles and dyeing materials known only to the Incas." He mentions identical tapestry work, mummy culture, artificial fertilizer, and terraced, irrigated agriculture. Since the massive architecture of Peru lacks any element of the arch, while closely comparable structures in the East Indies have a rudimentary keystone, he suggests that the drift of culture was westward from Peru. The westward equatorial currents, he asserts, would increase this probability. He writes, "There is so much evidence of the diffusion of American culture along the equator to the west that it is difficult to say

form of keeping records by knotted cords or by tally sticks. It was an excellent method of keeping quantitative records, that is, of numbers, but a poor method of recording qualitative ideas and emotions. The Peruvians had remarkable statistical records, but little philosophy. Is it not possible that in India and China as writing developed, the use of knots was no longer valuable for transmitting qualitative ideas, but was retained for numbers? Its form may have changed from knotted cords to the abacus. Perhaps here was the beginning of the separation of the two forms of language which play such distinct parts in modern life—the written language of qualitative thinking (literature) and the symbol language of quantitative thinking (mathematics).

which particular part it came from." Like the Incas of ancient Peru, the primitive Toradjas, he states, "have no idea of value, other than the value of use." He quotes "Dr. Van Dalen, who is head of the church at Depok," as stating that "the weaving, method of production, and dyeing was exactly like that practiced in Peru."

In a later letter Mr. Williams writes that the mummy wrappings of the Incas are identical in type with ceremonial headdress of the Toradja nobility, used also as burial cloths. He refers to an article by J. W. van Nouhuys in No. 4 of the tenth year of the periodical *Nederlandsch Indisch oud en Nieuw*. This view was supported, according to Williams, by Dr. Van Dalen, who "was a missionary in Galumpang in the upper Karama Territory in one of the least known Toradja districts. He collected a large number of these death cloths for the Colonial Museum . . . If this culture landed in Celebes it is quite natural for it to be found in other islands of the East Indies."

Mr. Williams included with his letter photographs of two "death cloths." One is a photograph of a Peruvian mummy wrapped in a death cloth, now in the British Museum; the other is of a Toradja death cloth from the Islands of Celebes. At last report it was in the Imperial Dutch Museum. The designs of these two death cloths are identical.

As every anthropologist knows, similarities of culture in different parts of the world are very numerous, and no single case, or even several cases, proves identity of origin. However, the repetition of such similarities is cumulative evidence. Those mentioned were picked up by the writer almost at random, without thorough search. If careful search and comparison should disclose many more cases of likeness, the results might be convincing. Such a study would need to be made deliberately and critically, without preconceived conclusions, for few persons are so intimately acquainted with both the culture of ancient Peru and those of the Pacific

islands and the East Indies as to be equipped beforehand to make a dependable judgment. The writer has observed in his own profession that strong running currents of professional opinion may be traditional rather than critical in origin, and so he ventures to drop a suggestion in the hope of stimulating an unconventional approach to the question.

Had the traveler Hythloday reached Ceylon and Calicut from Peru, perhaps by way of the Marquesas Islands, he would have found the Portuguese already active in the East Indies, and might thus have found his way back to Europe. More states that Hythloday was a Portuguese, and had returned from the East Indies on a Portuguese vessel. In that case he might rank as the first man of historic record to circumnavigate the earth. The data presented are all too fragmentary to supply the basis for a conclusion, but may lead to an interest in the subject which will tend to throw more light on the possibility.

The idea of circumnavigation of the earth was not new with Columbus, Copernicus, Thomas More, or Magellan, or with the period which produced them. That idea of the rotundity of the earth, which, after being current among the Greeks for more than a thousand years, had been deliberately suppressed by the church in about the sixth century A.D., seems not to have been generally revived until *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* was published in the late fourteenth century. In that miscellaneous collection of narratives, discourses, and legends which were compiled and presented over a century before Columbus' first voyage to America, there is lengthy discussion of how the pole star disappears as one travels south, while the Antarctic star appears and rises higher. The author
observations other men have estimate
of the earth to be 20,425 miles, [illegible]
be 31,500 miles.[3] (The Greeks at

B.C. had calculated the circumference of the earth as about 28,000 miles.)

The narrator in Mandeville's *Travels* insists that a man may go all around the earth, "as well under as above," and that "always he should find men, lands, and isles," and that those who dwell on one side of the earth "be straight feet against feet" of those who dwell on the other side. Then he continues with a story which might have supplied a suggestion to Thomas More, of "how a worthy man departed some-time from our countries for to go search the world. And so he passed Ind and the isles beyond Ind, where be more than 5,000 isles. And so long he went by sea and land, and so environed the world by many seasons, that he found an isle where he heard speak his own language. . . . whereof he had great marvel, for he knew not how it might be. But I say, that he had gone so long by land and by sea, that he had environed all the earth . . ." [4]

It has been said that no book was so generally read at the close of the fourteenth century as Sir John Mandeville's *Travels*.[5] Thomas More, therefore, would not have needed a traveler such as Hythloday to give him the idea of the circumnavigation of the earth.

Having presented the evidence conveniently at hand, both for and against the probability that More was describing an actual trip around the earth, we leave the question to those who may be intrigued by it.

PART TWO

THE UTOPIAN TRADITION

V

The Origins of Utopia

THE UTOPIAN TRADITION PROBABLY HAD many beginnings. Plato's *Republic*, believed to have been written between 390 and 370 B.C., often has been referred to as the original. Yet this is far from being the case. According to Aristotle, in his *Politics*, it was not Plato, but one Phaleas of Chalcedon, who "was the first to affirm that the citizens of a state ought to have equal possessions." Utopian writing had, in fact, become so common in Greece that, possibly even before Plato's *Republic* appeared, Aristophanes presented a burlesque of utopias—*The Ecclesiazusae*, or *Women in Parliament*, the more grotesque parts of which were aimed at proposals for relations of the sexes similar to those which were presented in the *Republic* and the *Laws*. The remainder of the theme, however, deals with the age-old problem of the economic organization of society. Had the following extract from this amusing travesty been published in 1888, just after Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, undoubtedly it would have been taken as a caricature of that work, and a point-by-point parallel could have been made of every item of utopian theory which it presents. In fact, Bellamy was accused of plagiarizing Aristophanes.

The plot of the comedy is that the women of Athens, disguised as men, appear in the parliament or assembly

and vote that thereafter the women shall rule the city. In the following passages, Prexagora, the woman who was chief instigator of the plot and is now head of the women's government, outlines the new social order to her husband, Blepyrus, and to their neighbor, Chremes:

PREXAGORA: I've an excellent scheme, if you will but believe it;
But I cannot be sure how our friends will receive it;
Or what they will do, if the old I eschew,
And propound them a system erratic and new.
This makes me a trifle alarmed and faint-hearted.

BLEPYRUS: As to that, you may safely be fearless and bold;
We adore what is new, and abhor what is old.
This rule we retain when all else has departed.

PREXAGORA: Then all to the speaker in silence attend
And don't interrupt till I come to the end,
And weigh and perpend, till you quite comprehend,
The drift and intent of the scheme I present.
The rule which I dare to enact and declare
Is that all shall be equal, and equally share
All wealth and enjoyments, nor longer endure
That one should be rich, and another be poor,
That one should have acres, far-stretching and wide,
And another not even enough to provide
Himself with a grave: that this at his call
Should have hundreds of servants, and that none at all.
All this I intend to correct and amend:
Now all of all blessings shall freely partake
One life and one system for all men I make.

BLEPYRUS: And how will you manage it?

PREXAGORA: First, I'll provide
That the silver, and land, and whatever beside
Each man shall possess, shall be common and free,
One fund for the public; then out of it we
Will feed and maintain you, like housekeepers true,
Dispensing, and sparing, and caring for you.

BLEPYRUS: With regard to the land, I can quite understand,
But how, if a man have his money in hand,
Not farms, which you see, and he cannot withhold,
But talents of silver and Darics of gold?

PREXAGORA: All this to the stores he must bring.

BLEPYRUS: But suppose
He choose to retain it, and nobody knows:
Rank perjury doubtless; but what if it be?
'Twas by that he acquired it at first.

PREXAGORA: I agree
But now 'twill be useless; he'll need it no more.

BLEPYRUS: How mean you?

PREXAGORA: All pressure from want will be o'er.
Now each will have all that a man can desire,
Cakes, barley-loaves, chestnuts, abundant attire,
Wine, garlands and fish: then why should he wish
The wealth he has gotten by fraud to retain?
If you know any reason, I hope you'll explain.

BLEPYRUS: 'Tis those that have most of these goods, I believe,
That are always the worst and the keenest to thieve.*

* This criticism is identical with that made by Aristotle in his *Politics* when discussing the utopias of the time.

PREXAGORA: I grant you, my friend, in the days that are past,
In your old-fashioned system, abolished at last:
But what he's to gain, though his wealth he retain,
When all things are common, I'd have you explain.

. . . . . .

BLEPYRUS: Just one other thing. If an action they bring,
What funds will be mine for discharging the fine?
You won't pay it out of the stores, I opine.

PREXAGORA: A fine to be paid when an action they bring!
Why bless you, our people won't know such a thing
As an action.

BLEPYRUS: No actions! I feel a misgiving.
Pray what are "our people" to do for a living?

CHREMES: You are right: there are many will rue it.

PREXAGORA: No doubt.
But what can one then bring an action about?

BLEPYRUS: There are reasons in plenty; I'll just mention one.
If a debtor won't pay you, pray what's to be done?

PREXAGORA: If a debtor won't pay! Nay, but tell me, my friend,
How the creditor came by the money to lend?
All money, I thought, to the stores had been brought.
I've got a suspicion, I say it with grief,
Your creditor's surely a bit of a thief.

CHREMES: Now that is an answer acute and befitting.

BLEPYRUS: But what if a man should be fined for committing
Some common assault, when elated with wine;

Pray what are his means for discharging that fine?
I have posed you, I think.

PREXAGORA: Why, his victuals and drink
Will be stopped by command for awhile; and I guess
That he will not again in a hurry transgress,
When he pays with his stomach.

BLEPYRUS: Will thieves be unknown?

PREXAGORA: Why, how should they steal what is partly their

BLEPYRUS: No chance then to meet at night in the street
Some highwayman coming our cloaks to abstract?

PREXAGORA: No, not if you're sleeping at home; nor, in fact,
Though you choose to go out. That trade, why pursue it?
There's plenty for all: but suppose him to do it,
Don't fight and resist him; what need of a pother?
You can go to the stores, and they'll give you another.

BLEPYRUS: Shall we gambling forsake?

PREXAGORA: Why, what could you stake?

BLEPYRUS: But what is the style of our living to be?

PREXAGORA: One common to all, independent and free,
All bars and partitions for ever undone,
All private establishments fused into one.

BLEPYRUS: Then where, may I ask, will our dinners be laid?

PREXAGORA: Each court and arcade of the law shall be made
A banqueting-hall for the citizens.

BLEPYRUS: Right.

. . . . . .

PREXAGORA: . . . There'll be plenty for all, and to spare.
No stint and no grudging our system will know,
But each will away from the revelry go,
Elated and grand, with a torch in his hand,
And a garland of flowers in his hair.[1]

These early utopians, whom Aristophanes satirized here, and several of whom wrote during Plato's lifetime, did not begin the tradition. Three or four hundred years earlier, probably during the eighth or ninth century B.C., Lycurgus, according to tradition, was defining for Sparta a remarkable government and social order which he so carefully designed and so firmly established that it persisted for several centuries, and made Sparta the master of Greece. The Greek biographer, Plutarch, wrote, " . . . all those who have written well on politics, as Plato, Diogenes, and Zeno, have taken Lycurgus as their model, leaving behind them, however, mere projects and words; whereas Lycurgus was the author, not in writing but in reality, of a government which none else could so much as copy. . . ."

Plutarch, writing after about nine hundred years, seems to have the impression that Lycurgus created his system of government *de novo*. It is far more probable that the great Spartan lawgiver did not so much create a new order of society as regularize and codify the folkways of the people, bringing into the form of orderly law what before was only custom and tradition, perhaps with many crudities and incongruities. Otherwise acceptance of his code would have

been less complete, for the intimate ways of the people are not quickly changed.

Probably about the time Lycurgus was establishing his regime at Sparta the Greek poet Hesiod, according to tradition, was singing utopian songs of the Hyperboreans. And then it is recorded that contemporaneously, or perhaps a century or two before, Homer sang of the Hyperboreans and the Aethiopians, at the opposite ends of the earth, each with utopian attributes. Probably Hesiod and Homer did not invent the themes of their songs. They doubtless were near the last of a long line of tribal bards who for ages had transmitted mythology, history, and folk songs by word of mouth, until some of their tales were captured and made more nearly permanent by the art of writing. Similarly, Plato's description of Atlantis doubtless reflects folk tales, common all the way from Arabia to Ireland, of a mystical land in the West where a good society prevailed.

But the Greeks were not alone among Mediterranean peoples in this building of utopias. A little way to the east, among the hills of Palestine, there was a parallel tradition.

Probably centuries before the themes of Homer had been reduced to writing, before Hesiod sang, or Lycurgus had given his laws to Sparta, the voice of the prophet Samuel had been raised in Palestine. Then, as time passed, the cities became corrupt, and the voice seemed to have died. But in herdsmen's cottages and on mountain pastures it was remembered. There developed or persisted in these communities a strong feeling against the evils of the times, and a dream of a better time to come.

This prophetic tradition evidently grew from generation to generation. Then among the rural people there appeared men of unusual power: Amos, about 760 B.C., and Hosea about twenty-five years later, are the first after Samuel whose names we know, who felt that they had a message

from God. As with utopias of all ages, their messages begin with a denunciation of present evils, and proceed to a picture of a better day. Listen to Amos:

> ... I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son: but I was an herdman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit: And the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel.[2]
>
> Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, Saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the measure small, and the money great, and falsifying the balances by deceit? That we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes; yea, and sell the refuse of the wheat? ... Shall not the land tremble for this, and every one mourn that dwelleth therein? ... I will turn your feasts into mourning... I will make it as the mourning of an only son, and the end thereof as a bitter day ...[3]
>
> Though they dig into hell, thence shall mine hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down.[4]

He calls on the people to change their ways:

> Seek good, and not evil, that ye may live ... let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.[5]

But after such outbursts as these, the message attributed to the herdsman ends with a different tone, as it tells of the day when right living will have borne its perfect fruit:

> Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that ... the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt ... they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them. And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God.[6]

A few years later condemnation of present evil and pictures of Utopia became more definite. What was begun by rude herdsmen was taken up by men of great emotional and literary power. The early temper of stern rigor grew into tenderness and compassion. The utopian message reached a high pitch with Isaiah:

> . . . and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.[7]

> And they shall build houses and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord.[8]

Jeremiah and Ezekiel and others of lesser power further swelled the volume of these protests, and of the utopian dream. During this period there appeared another utopia, in the literary form of a message from Moses, though doubtless written centuries after his death, outlining a legal and social code and translating the general aspirations of the prophets into detailed application. Among advanced social ideas in this code were provisions that once every seven years all debts were to be cancelled and that all slaves and servants of their own people were to be liberated and given a start in life. To a degree which is not fully known, this utopian code of Deuteronomy actually became the law of the people.

But again the years passed, and the utopia was not realized. Then came a great prophet, who summed up all of the Hebrew utopian message and carried it further, so that his picture of Utopia, "the Kingdom of God on earth," has been the guiding star of men's aspirations for nearly two millenniums, its central theme being "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," and

"Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done, in reality as it is in Utopia."

With the Hebrews as with the Greeks the utopian message seems to begin between history and legend. Since they wrote on papyrus or parchment, it is probable that many of their earliest writings have perished. Yet the trail of Utopia is not entirely lost. In Egypt and Mesopotamia, where use of clay tablets gave greater permanence to writing, and where civilizations came to maturity much earlier, we can pick it up again.

An instance of incipient utopianism is contained in a letter to the Assyrian King Ashurbanipal, written about the middle of the seventh century B.C., not far from the time when the Greek bard Hesiod was singing, and when Amos was picturing his utopia to villagers of Palestine. According to Thorkild Jacobsen, of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, "The writer hopes that the new king is to institute a period of bliss, to fulfill the utopian ideal, and he sees clear signs of it already": [9]

Ashur the king of the gods proclaims the name of the king my lord for the dominion of the land of Assyria. Shamash and Adad, through their steadfast regard for the king my lord (and) his dominion of the lands, have established a gracious reign, orderly days, years of righteousness, abundant rains, copious inundations, and acceptable prices. The gods are graciously inclined. The fear of god is strong. The temples cause prosperity. The great gods of heaven and earth are favorably disposed to the king my lord. Old men dance, the youth sing, matrons and maidens are gay with laughter. The women are taken in marriage, they are embraced, they bring sons and daughters to birth. Reproduction is blest. To him whose sin condemned to death, the king my lord has restored newness of life. Those who have been imprisoned for many years, you are set free. Those who have been sick many

days are recovered. The hungry are satisfied. The lean grow fat. The destitute are supplied with clothing.[10]

And we may follow back the utopian theme in the Euphrates valley for still another two thousand years beyond King Ashurbanipal. To quote Jacobsen further:

From very early times the Sumerians had a clear and definite conception of what human society should be like. Their picture of the ideal state stresses respect towards parents and older brothers and sisters within the family, fair dealings and uprightness in relations with others, and particularly the idea of social justice. As is only natural in view of the fact that the Sumerians had a highly autocratic conception of the state, the person who was responsible for the realization and upholding of this ideal was the ruler.

Our earliest evidence of the existence of this ideal dates back to shortly after 2650 B.C. when Urukagina, ruler of Lagash, states as his obligation to prevent the mighty from harming the weak and defenseless, especially orphans and windows. From then on this ideal is often reflected in royal inscriptions and other literature. I may quote as a detailed example that the ruler Ishme-Dagan prays that the sungod, god of righteousness, "may place in my mouth righteousness and truthfulness" and that he will "make it my lot" to "give in right fashion judgments and decisions to the people," to deal well with the upright man, to destroy the criminal, "to have respect shown father, mother, and elder sister," to see that "the weak is not delivered up to the mighty," that "the powerful is not allowed to do according to his desire," that freemen are not put in fetters, "to destroy criminality and violence and to cause righteousness to grow." This example dates from shortly before 2200 B.C. From the references in royal inscriptions it is clear that this Utopian ideal was wholly accepted by Mesopotamian rulers, at least as an ideal. It may—as other Utopias—have had practical effects in shaping actual policies.[11]

Before such a statement would be made as a declaration of national policy it must have had a long period of incubation in the national mind.

Across the way in Egypt also, the utopian or messianic theme was having its long course of development. Dr. John A. Wilson, Director of the Oriental Institute, has described that tradition:

> There was messianism in Egypt at a very early date. The documents make this simply a return from a time of anarchy and disorder to "the good old days" of peace and prosperity. At times when there was distress in Egypt certain social prophets looked forward to the return of good and just rulers who would re-establish order and content in the land.
>
> The ancient Egyptian did not have directly a concept of an Atlantis as a distant country in which things were well ordered and life was plentiful. He did, however, have certain concepts which contributed to the idea of an Atlantis. There is a fairy tale of a sailor who was shipwrecked on an eastern island where life was abundant and good. In line with this is the designation of eastern countries in general as "god's lands." From Somaliland, Arabia, the eastern desert, and Syria-Palestine, the great sun god came as the sun rises on the eastern horizon. There is a vague feeling that "god's land" has certain desirable qualities, certain ideal aspects which Egypt does not have and which may be invisible in the geographic districts which I have listed. That thought plays into the fairy tale of the shipwrecked sailor and the ideal island.[12]

Ancient utopian tradition was not limited to the Mediterranean region. In the Far East at some unknown time, perhaps contemporaneous with Plato or a century earlier, "Dialogues of the Buddha" began to be passed from generation to generation by word of mouth, much as were the Homeric stories, until they were put in writing in Ceylon shortly before the beginning of the Christian era. The fol-

lowing passage, from the translation of T. W. Rhys Davids and his wife, is about a pacifist king who will reign in the far future, when the span of human life will be vastly extended, and when the only diseases or physical weaknesses known will be appetite, non-assimilation, and old age:

> Among such humans, at Ketumati the royal city, there will arise Sankha, a Wheel-turning king, righteous and ruling in righteousness, lord of the four quarters, conqueror, protector of his people, possessor of the seven precious things. His will be these seven precious things, to wit: the Wheel, the Elephant, the Horse, the Gem, the Woman, the Housefather, the Councillor. More than a thousand also will be his offspring, heroes, vigorous of frame, crushers of the hosts of the enemy. He will live in supremacy over this earth to its ocean bounds, having conquered it not by the scourge, not by the sword, but by righteousness.[13]

We might guess that at the time this "dialogue" was originated, the wheel was a new and wonderful invention.

In India the utopian view attributed to Buddha did not hold an enduring place, while the accounts of the Golden Age in Hindu sacred literature tended to be pure mythology, with but slight suggestion that such conditions can be achieved by human effort. The Buddhist picture was also carried to China, but there it met no better fate. China already had its own utopias, coming down from the distant past, and by the time Buddhism reached there, an ingrained habit had developed of looking backward rather than forward for the Good Life.

In very ancient China utopian writings formed an important part of the classic literature. One of these, of about the close of the sixth century B.C., is "The Grand Course" of Confucius, which is quoted in the following chapter on "The Golden Age." This occurs in the seventh book of the *Li Ki*.[14]

The third book of the *Li Ki* also is a well developed utopia,

known as the "Wang-Chih," or "Institutes of the King." [15] It dates probably from the first or second century B.C. It goes into some detail as to distribution of land, education, conservation of natural resources, budget-making, taxation, selection of men for civil service, and administration of justice. In its general purpose it might be compared with the book of Deuteronomy in the Old Testament.

The other great Chinese utopia dating from before the Christian era is the *Chow Li*, which forms one of the major Confucianist classics. In the opinion of Dr. Hu Shih, recently Chinese Ambassador to the United States, who has made a long study of Chinese utopias, this interesting political utopia is the outgrowth of an earlier work entitled *Chou Kwan*, of the second century B.C. Just as Plato's *Republic* was not wholly original in creation, but was the outgrowth of utopian thinking and writing of many centuries preceding, so it is highly probable that the utopias of Lâo Tse, Confucius, and others of those early centuries, harked back to similar utopian thinking and writing of still earlier days. This is specifically the opinion of many students.

After the Chinese utopians who wrote before the Christian era, according to Dr. Hu Shih, "for nearly twenty centuries of unified empire life there was very little original and courageous social and political thinking, and consequently practically no utopian writing worthy of the name. Much of the unorthodox political thinking took the form of commentaries or amplifications of the *Chow Li* which had become one of the major classics." [16] Again, according to Dr. Hu Shih, probably the only example of utopian writing in medieval China is a short essay of a few hundred words, "Peach Blossom Village," written in the fifth century of the Christian era. It pictures a village in which a group of families had found shelter and livelihood for centuries, free from taxation, wars, or devastation, but it attempts no positive political or social speculation. Since numberless remote

villages in China have retained their prehistoric type of social organization down to the present century, it would seem not impossible that such a "utopia" would be an actual record of a small community which in an isolated nook had escaped the impact of the feudal age.

Passing over two barren millenniums we come to the most elaborate utopia in Chinese literature, the *Ching Hua Yüan*, or "Flowers in the Mirror," by Li Ju-Cheu.[17] Written through a period of years and finished about 1825, it is a novel of a hundred chapters. It was written partly as a way to make the public familiar with a phonetic system which the author had invented. The significance in Chinese usage of the title may be inferred from the quotation, "perhaps for us that future will be as illusory as *flowers in the mirror*, or the reflection of the moon in the rippling stream." In comparison with the matter-of-fact *Utopia*, or "nowhere," of Thomas More, the lighter touch of this title is characteristically Chinese.

The setting of the story is in the reign of Empress Wu, about A.D. 700. One part of thirty-three chapters is an imaginary account, somewhat in the manner of *Gulliver's Travels*, of a visit of Tang Ao and his friends to distant countries and strange peoples. Some of these are grotesque stories, as of a country where men had such large ears that in sleeping they would use one for a mattress and the other for a cover. Others suggest modern inventions, such as flying carriages, illustrated as operated by propellers. Most of the chapters are intended to point out existing evils of Chinese society, and to picture better ways of living, as is the case with utopias the world over. A part of one of these sketches, "The Country of Great Men," is quoted in the chapter on "The Golden Age."

Another, "The Country of Gentlemen," is particularly utopian. In it men high and low, rich and poor, mutually respect each other's feelings without reference to the wealth

or social status of either; and this after all is the essence of what constitutes a true gentleman. The name of the country would have a utopian inference to the Chinese mind, as it was a cardinal teaching of Confucius that the world will be civilized when it is inhabited by gentlemen.

Still another Chinese utopia, the *Ta T'ung Shu,* or "The Great Unity," by K'and Ye-wei, though written in 1884, has only recently been published. This has been reviewed by Chi-Chen Wang. Taking for his text the Confucian utopia, "The Grand Course," the author develops his theme methodically. He holds that man is by nature kind, and that he is inclined to seek happiness and avoid suffering. Because of perversion of our nature by our institutions, suffering is the chief reality of human life. He describes the sources of sorrow and the causes of suffering, and proposes a program for their gradual elimination by such means as world government, abolition of classes and mixing of races, improvement of diet, equality of the sexes, abolition of the family, education, communal government, kindness to animals, and labor-saving technology.

We see that, widespread as has been the urge to visualize a good society, its development has been far from uniform. Icelandic scholars report that little of the utopian theme appears in Scandinavian literature until after the coming of Christianity from the south.

The Scandinavian Edda, *Voluspo,* contains most of the elements characteristic of utopias—strife, corruption, defeat, and a picture of a better world. War comes to earth, and the gods fight with the Wanes:

> On the host his spear did Othin hurl,
> Then in the world did war first come;
> The wall that girdled the gods was broken,
> And the field by the warlike Wanes was trodden.[18]

Evil times come to the earth, and after much stress and battle the earth is destroyed:

> Brothers shall fight and fell each other,
> And sisters' sons shall kinship stain;
> Hard is it on earth, with mighty whoredom;
> Axe-time, sword-time, shields are sundered,
> Wind-time, wolf-time, ere the world falls;
> Nor ever shall men each other spare.[19]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The sun turns black, earth sinks in the sea,
> The hot stars down from heaven are whirled;
> Fierce grows the steam and the life-feeding flame,
> Till fire leaps high about heaven itself.[20]

Finally a new earth rises, and a good day comes:

> Now do I see the earth anew
> Rise all green from the waves again;
> The cataracts fall, and the eagle flies,
> And fish he catches beneath the cliffs.[21]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> In wondrous beauty once again
> Shall the golden tables stand mid the grass,
> Which the gods had owned in the days of old.[22]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Then fields unsowed bear ripened fruit,
> All ills grow better, and Baldr comes back;
> Baldr and Hoth dwell in Hropt's battle-hall,
> And the mighty gods: would you know yet more? [23]
>
> More fair than the sun, a hall I see,
> Roofed with gold, on Gimle it stands;
> There shall the righteous rulers dwell,
> And happiness ever there shall they have.[24]

This poetic story, probably composed about a thousand years ago and reduced to writing a few centuries later, may have been indirectly influenced by the Christian tradition. It is perhaps the nearest to a utopia which has survived from early Norse literature.

Across the ocean, in the land of the Aztecs, there was a utopian tradition of great antiquity. J. H. Cornyn, the Aztec scholar, translator of the "Song of Quetzalcoatl," has given us a picture of "The Promised Land of the Nahuas":

The later Nahuatl races, to which the Toltecs and Nahuas belonged, had a well-defined tradition of a promised land where life would be ever pleasant and the soil ever fruitful. This promised land was both behind them and before them. Huemac, guider of the first exodus of Toltecs from their mythical home in the north, led his people, before the beginning of the Christian era, toward Temoanchan (*temoa*, they seek, *in*, their, *chan*, home; that is, the home they are seeking), where power, glory, and felicity awaited them. Temoanchan was compared, by the Nahua poets, to the home of the earth gods in the highest mountains. It was, therefore, a terrestrial paradise to which Huemac led his people.

Upwards of a thousand years later, other Toltecs, under another great leader, transformed the tradition of Huemac into that of Quetzalcoatl, messenger of the gods, who brought to them from the Sun the culture of the Sunland and instituted in the Valley of Mexico, the golden age to which, later on, Aztec poets looked back with unrestrained admiration and longing. For they believed that this vanished glorious age was to return with even greater splendour, power and glory for the Nahuatl people.

"The Song of Quetzalcoatl," the greatest of the sagas of the American Indian races, recounts the mythical struggle that took place between Quetzalcoatl, the Wind God, and Tezcatlipoca, the Moon God, in Tula, the famous Toltec capital, the highway

to which was "traveled all the daytime, traveled all the nighttime." Tezcatlipoca, with his arts of enchantment, brought unnumbered plagues upon Tula. Toward the end of the eleventh century, the famous city was destroyed and the Toltecs scattered to the four winds of heaven. The enemy forced Quetzalcoatl to leave the city and to return to the Sun from which he had come on his mission of culture. Leaving the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, Quetzalcoatl sent back four of his followers to govern Cholula, the later metropolis of the Toltecs, promising them that he would return and take from the hands of their descendants the government of Mexico; and that his regime would be more regal, happier and more glorious than that of the vanished golden age of the Toltecs.

According to this legend the land of Tula was rich beyond all comparison; there the corn-ears were so big one could scarcely embrace them with the outstretched arms, and the cotton grew in all shades and colors so that "no need was there to dye it."* There was untold wealth in Tula and no one was ever in want. This was the golden age to which the Aztecs looked back and of which their poets sang in rapturous verse. But it was also the paradise to which they looked forward with longing and anxiety, with the return of the Wind God, in all his majesty, power and glory.

*Compare with the utopian Fourth Eclogue of Virgil: "the ram shall of his own accord, even while at pasture, change the colour of his fleece, now into sweet-blushing purple, now into saffron hue. Scarlet shall spontaneously clothe the lambs as they feed." [Bryce, A. Hamilton, trans., *The Works of Virgil* (London, George Bell & Sons, 1907), p. 22]

In the science column of the *New York Times* for January 9, 1944, we read: "The day may be not far distant when a woman may choose the color of her dress from the plant as the result of work done by the Russians and the Delta Experimental Station of Mississippi. No dyes are used. The color is nature's own. . . . The Russians claim to have developed color-fast lints in red, green, auburn, dark brown, blue and khaki."

So unquestionably was this tradition believed by the Aztecs that Montezuma II, convinced that Cortes was the expected Quetzalcoatl come back to govern the land, dared not, famous warrior though he was, offer resistance to the Spaniards. The great tragedy of destruction of the Aztec empire was largely due to this native expectation of the coming of an age happier and more glorious than that of the gold days of the Aztecs.[25]

The lore of the North American Indian, so far as we have found, has little of that element, though among the Iroquois there were traces or beginnings of utopian expectation. It is interesting that the Aztec utopian god, Quetzalcoatl, is represented as a white man, and as having come from the East.

In Japan, as in medieval China, utopian writing has played a negligible part. Some modern Chinese utopias, such as *The United States of the World*, by K'ang Yeow Wei, seems certainly to be inspired from the West.

Man's conscious aspiration for a good life in the future, with deliberate effort to picture the conditions of a good society, found its fullest and perhaps its highest early expression near the eastern shores of the Mediterranean.

How far back of the ancient clay tablets of Assyria, of the writings of Lâo Tse and Confucius, of the traditions of Ceylon, and of the legends of the Aztecs, would it be necessary to go to reach the beginning of the utopian dream? We do not know. Every animal as it grows from infancy, every plant as it springs from a seed, seems to be moved by an inner impulse to fulfill the type through which it must find expression. The drive to realize an ideal is a universal, inherent characteristic of life itself. Since man cannot read the minds of other animals, he may claim to be the sole possessor of conscious design for his future, having a monopoly of visions of a good society in a good world. We might define man as the animal that makes utopias.

As we trace the growth of Greek and Hebrew utopian traditions, we are tempted to suggest that these two views of a future good society had a common origin in the distant past, perhaps the same origin as that of similar traditions in the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates, and that, some time before the earliest recorded Greek literature, they became divided. Thereupon each may have developed according to the genius of the people, and each took its separate course for many more years. Let us pick up these utopian threads where we left them—the Greek tradition with Plato's *Republic*, and the Christian utopia with the "Sermon on the Mount"—and carry them forward.*

In Greek and Roman literature there are many utopian expressions, though many of them are dominantly mythological or idyllic, too far removed from reality to influence the actual course of events. Virgil's Fourth Eclogue, written about 40 B.C., which is typical of much of this writing, was made famous by efforts to interpret it as a forecast of the coming of Christ.

It was about A.D. 100 that the Greek, Plutarch, wrote his *Lycurgus*, the lawgiver of very ancient Sparta, who had lived about nine hundred years before. How much this is a true biography, and how much it is a utopia by Plutarch, authorities are not agreed. *Lycurgus* has had far-reaching influence as a chief inspiration for numerous later utopian writers.

Then, nearly three hundred years after Plutarch wrote *Lycurgus*, there appeared another picture of an ideal society, this time in the Hebrew-Christian tradition, St. Augustine's *City of God*, completed in A.D. 426. J. O. Hertzler, in his *History of Utopian Thought*,[26] says of this work, "It played an important part in the plans of kings and popes, and the schemes of empires and hierarchies." In his *City of God* Augustine showed that it was not the giving up of paganism

* Jesus, living in Greek-cultured Galilee, was influenced by Greek Stoicism as well as by Hebrew prophetical thought. They were united in him.

from which Rome was suffering, but rather a failure to live according to Christian principles. He pictured a universal order in which peace with God would be followed by peace among men, an order in which the church would be the dominant institution, with governments as its instruments.

As in China the utopian spirit, after an early vigorous growth, lay dormant for nearly two thousand years until it was quickened into fresh life by contact with new ideas and new patterns of living from other continents; so also in the western world it appears that the utopian impulse, so vigorous around the shores of the Mediterranean in an earlier age, was not strong enough of itself to stimulate a radically new vision in medieval Europe. There it required the greater stimulus of knowledge of a remarkable social order in a hitherto unknown land.

Unless we should class Dante's *De Monarchia* among utopias, we have an interval of nearly eleven hundred years between St. Augustine's *City of God* and the next great utopia with which the western world is generally familiar—More's *Utopia.* It should not be assumed that the utopian view was wholly absent during this long period. The same urge was latent in men's spirits and frequently flamed up.

For instance, there is that compilation of ancient and medieval lore and legend already referred to, known as *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville.* This miscellaneous collection which, even as a Mandeville compilation in the 1370's, dates from more than a century before Thomas More, contains a brief utopia, "Of the Goodness of the Folk of the Isle of Bragman." Of them the account states:

> And, in general, all the men of those isles and of all the marches thereabout be more true than in any other countries thereabout, and more rightfull than others in all things. In that isle is no thief, ne murderer, ne common woman, ne poor beggar, ne never was man slain in that country . . . And they prize none

earthly riches; and so they be all rightfull. And they live full ordinately, and so soberly in meat and drink, that they live right long. And the most part of them die without sickness, when nature faileth them, for eld.[27]

According to this account, when Alexander the Great undertook to conquer them, they sent couriers to him with the message:

What may be enough to that man to whom all the world is insufficient? Thou shalt find nothing in us, that may cause thee to war against us. For we have no riches, ne none we covet, and all the goods of our country be in common. Our meat, that we sustain withal our bodies, is our riches. And, instead of treasures of gold and silver, we make our treasure of accord and peace, and for to love every man other . . . We have been in perpetual peace till now, that thou come to disinherit us . . . For justice ne hath not among us no place, for we do to no man otherwise than we desire that men do to us.[28]

Whereupon, the account states, Alexander left them alone. Quintus Curtius, first century, in his life of Alexander, includes a message presumably sent him by another people of simple life, the Scythians:

If the gods had wished the disposition of your body to be equal to the avidity of your mind, the world would not have held you. . . . What is your business in this land of ours? We have never touched the borders of yours. . . . We can serve no man nor do we desire to command any. That you may not be ignorant of the Scythian people, know that we have our gifts, the yoke, the plow, the spear, the arrow, the cup. We use these both with our friends and against our enemies. We give to our friends the grain grown with the labor of our oxen; we pour libations of wine from the cup to these gods; we seek our distant enemies with the arrows, those close at hand with the spear. . . . Your wars are the

children of your victories. For although you may be greater and stronger than anyone else, yet no one wishes to suffer foreign dominion.

You will know that though their country stretches far and wide, you will none the less never capture the Scythians. Our poverty will be swifter than your army which carries the booty of so many peoples.... Those upon whom you will not wage war, you may always enjoy as good friends. For friendship is strongest among equals and they appear equal who have not made a test of their strength against each other.[29]

The story of the Isle of Bragman may have had a similar early origin.

In harmony with the general habit of utopians, the *Travels* included not only this picture of a good society, but descriptions of evil conditions in other lands, which in effect were shrewd criticisms of prevailing evils in Church and State in Europe.

Because More, when he published *Utopia* in 1516, about twenty-five years after the discovery of America, seemed to break the silence of a thousand years, he has commonly been looked upon as an original genius who, out of his own mind and experience, created a picture of an ideal society.

The fact is, however, as a brief view of his background will indicate, that few writers of utopias were less definitely original or more certainly the product of their times or their environments. In earlier chapters the debt of Thomas More to ancient Peru has been discussed. While much of *Utopia* is in effect an account of the social structure of the Inca state, that source did not by any means set the limit to his possible borrowing. The following account, mostly written before the Peruvian source was discovered by the author, indicates some of the other influences which may have acted upon More. It is evident that, while he followed the Inca pattern, More wove into it much of the thought and feeling

of the Mediterranean utopian tradition and of the spirit of western Europe.

As already noted, when in 1485 the two young Oxford students, Linacre and Grocyn, visited Italy, they came home on fire with the new learning, and began the teaching of Greek at Oxford. Thomas More, then a boy of sixteen, was one of their pupils. The introduction into Oxford of Greek, including the pagan Plato, was a serious matter. The elder More, fearing that his son would be contaminated, took him out of Oxford, though not until friendships had been formed which lasted throughout his life.

By far the most important of these friends was John Colet, son of a London merchant, and twelve years older than More. In 1494 Colet went to Italy for two years. There and on his travels back and forth he seems to have come in contact with several powerful utopian currents. One was the re-emergence of the prefeudal, democratic, communal life of northern Europe, combined with simple Christianity, strikingly in contrast with the decadence and corruption of the church which then prevailed. According to Frederic Seebohm in his *Oxford Reformers*, Colet found this sincere devotion and high ethical quality in some primitive German monks with whom he stayed for a time, and probably also in the powerful personality and sermons of Savonarola, then at his best in Florence. At the Platonic Academy, Pico della Mirandola was becoming a devout disciple of Savonarola and, perhaps unconsciously, was striving for a harmony between the teachings of Plato and those of the founder of Christianity.

Colet returned to England a deeply convinced disciple both of the new Greek learning and of a regenerated and purified Christianity. A year or two later, Erasmus, the young Dutch student who was to go down in history as one of the great minds of his age, came to England on the first of his several visits. At Oxford and in London this

little group of friends—Colet, Linacre, Grocyn, More and Erasmus—began their lifelong friendship and their life work. Colet's was the dominating mind and spirit. He largely guided the thinking and feeling of More and remade that of Erasmus, who said of him, "When I listen to my friend Colet it seems to me like listening to Plato himself." He was a man of very great, thoroughly trained, and widely informed intelligence, of fine ethical quality, of practical capacity, and of unusual fearlessness.

He summed up and endeavored to find unity in Plato and the Greek tradition, the Hebrew prophets and Jesus, St. Augustine and his *City of God,* Savonarola and his idealized state, the primitive Christianity which was emerging, or persisting, in Germany, and the practical life of an Englishman. He was one of the first of the modern world to have a truly scientific temper, in that he was committed to full and free inquiry. He had a conviction which is a characteristic of any real faith—that sincere, open-minded search for the truth will not lead men astray.

Seebohm, in his *Oxford Reformers,* writing of the *Novum Instrumentum* of Erasmus and the *Utopia* of More, comments that it is remarkable "that two such works, written by two such men, should, in measure, be traceable to the influence and express the views of a more obscure but greater man than they. Yet, in truth, much of the merit of both these works belongs indirectly to Colet." [30]

Through Colet and his group, as expressed by Thomas More in his *Utopia,* the two lines of utopian thought which in the Greek and Hebrew traditions had been too widely separated since the beginning of the Christian Era, were again united and were added to the democratic community tradition of Britain and northern Europe.

Utopia was the work of a man under forty, who became more conservative with the years. As the forces of reaction

gradually overwhelmed John Colet's group, some moved toward Wyclif and a free, indigenous, English expression of religion, while others moved toward Rome. More was among the latter. In his later years he made life a burden for certain active Protestants.

Quite probably *Utopia* had in it something of the spirit of Colet, as well as of More's own genius. It breathes an English spirit which he later came to oppose—the spirit of Wyclif and of *Piers Plowman.* Wyclif, who lived a century and a half earlier than More, was perhaps the greatest religious mind that appeared in Europe for a thousand years. Huss directly and Luther indirectly were his spiritual children. His English version of the Bible and his traveling preachers, the Lollards, rooted the spirit of freedom and genuine piety so deeply in English life that reaction and oppression never killed it.

The great English poem, *Piers Plowman,* of the 1360's and 1370's, has in it so much of inspired common sense as to suggest that its origin was not unassociated with Wyclif's ideas. The headquarters of Wyclif were at Oxford, and although his movement was formally suppressed in the University, it probably continued there informally, as it did all over England. Even with the lack of specific documentary evidence, it seems most likely that Colet and his followers came into possession, not only of the tradition of Greece and Italy, but also of the spirit of Wyclif, the Lollards, and *Piers Plowman,* to which the English spirit is so largely indebted.

W. H. Fyfe, in an article entitled "Tacitus's Germania and More's Utopia,"[31] draws attention to the very great similarity of some of the sentences of *Utopia,* which was written in Latin, to sentences in the *Germania* of Tacitus. The Latin style and use of words, he holds, are strikingly alike. Along with this similarity in form and tone are certain likenesses of description, such as the statement in each that

women accompanied their husbands into battle, though that particular point might have been taken from Plato's *Republic.* The attitude toward suicide, and the habit of mothers of nursing their own children, are similar. Tacitus's *Germania* had been published in Venice in 1470 and may have been brought to England by More's friends, who spent some time in Venice.

Thus More's *Utopia*—though it seems suddenly to have appeared after a gap of more than a thousand years, during which almost the only ideal society men wrote about was in another world—was no new creation, without intellectual parentage. As clearly as any other utopian writing it has its roots in the past. At no earlier moment could one mind have united these great traditions: the classic Greek view of life; the essential ethical spirit of the Hebrew prophets and of Jesus, which expressed itself in revulsion against the injustice of the time; the democratic community spirit of England and northern Europe; and the new spirit of open-minded, critical, scientific inquiry, which, since the days of Greece and early Rome, had found little freedom of expression.

Just how much Thomas More borrowed from Herodotus, from Plato, from Plutarch's *Lycurgus,* from St. Augustine's *City of God,* and from Tacitus's *Germania,* has been the subject of much speculation. It is doubtful whether a great deal of additional light will ever be thrown on that question. When we come to measure the relative weight of the various traditions in the content of More's *Utopia,* we find that the new, strange tradition of ancient Peru seems to outweigh them all and substantially fixes the social pattern which More presents, but we also find that it is interwoven with many elements from other sources.

Almost exactly a century after More's *Utopia,* three other utopias appeared within a short time. Perhaps the first of

these to be written, *The City of the Sun*, by Campanella, was last to be published, about 1623. This took its name, as well as part of its theme, from Peru. According to Felix Held, though it was published last of the three, it was written first and was read in manuscript by the German, Johann Valentin Andreae, whose utopia, *Christianopolis*, written in 1615, appeared in 1619. Again according to Held, Andreae's work largely determined the form and content of two other utopias, Bacon's unfinished *New Atlantis*, published posthumously, and Golt's *Nova Solyma*, published in 1648. Held states that Andreae's work was the original stimulus for the organization of the British Royal Society. At about the same time appeared Harrington's *Oceana*, 1656. In 1726 came Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. R. W. Chambers, in his *Thomas More*, writes, "From some aspects Swift seems to be More come to life again." In *Gulliver* the author gives *Utopia* the honor, rare with him, of direct and repeated imitation, and he repays his debt by depicting Thomas More as the one modern man worthy to rank with the five noblest men of antiquity.

From that time to the present, except for a few periods of relative inactivity, there has been a steady flow of utopias in nearly all European languages. It has been estimated that perhaps a thousand have been published in English alone. With the possible exceptions of Campanella and of Morelly, who wrote *The Basiliade*, not until Edward Bellamy appeared did another utopian writer follow Thomas More in consciously using the new, great utopian tradition, which had its roots in a different culture from those about the Mediterranean.

VI

The Golden Age

THE ANCIENT FABLES OF THE GOLDEN AGE were not all fabulous. Many of them had foundations of fact. Some of them were more or less shadowy records of societies which had excellent traits, appealing to the cravings of men for a good society. They gave reason for hope and belief that the traits which ought to characterize society are not impossible of achievement. What has been, may be again. If this is a sound inference from the facts, then there is no reason for withdrawing from men this reason for hope.

There were two general lines of Greek tradition concerning an ideal society. The expression "The Golden Age" originally referred to a specific element in Greek mythology which attempted to account for the origin of mankind. This tradition was similar to far earlier mythologies of Mesopotamia and India, and probably all had a common origin. They are almost purely mythological, and have little suggestion for the actual conduct of society.

Parallel with this mythology were legends of strange peoples, either of an earlier age or dwelling in remote parts of the world, who embodied ideal personal and social qualities. These range from almost pure mythology or fantasy through all degrees of realism to what seem to be straightforward factual accounts by travelers, or factual accounts of

earlier states of local societies. As the centuries passed, there was a fusing of the mythological with the historic, until often no division line is evident. The expression "The Golden Age," like the Platonic word "ideal," has gradually been broadened and blurred in its meaning, until in common usage it has come to be applied to any legendary age in which excellent conditions prevailed. It is chiefly in the sense of possible, actual good societies in the past, rather than of purely mythological tradition, that the term is used here.

The oldest clear expression of the Golden Age mythology in Greek literature is in Hesiod's collection of myths and legends, *Works and Days*, probably of the eighth century B.C. Describing the five ages of the world, he begins with the Golden Age:

> First of all the deathless gods having homes on Olympus made a golden race of mortal men. These lived in the time of Cronus when he was king in Heaven. Like gods they lived with hearts free from sorrow and remote from toil and grief; nor was miserable age their lot, but always unwearied in feet and hands they made merry in feasting, beyond the reach of all evils. And when they died, it was as though they were given over to sleep. And all good things were theirs. For the fruitful earth spontaneously bore them abundant fruit without stint. And they lived in ease and peace upon their lands with many good things, rich in flocks and beloved of the blessed gods.[1]

With the disappearance of the men of the Golden Age the gods created in succession a race of silver, then a race of bronze, who destroyed themselves by their own hands, then a race of heroes, who also died in warfare, and finally a race of iron—our own. This story, with endless variations and interpretations, was worked over by Greek and Roman poets and philosophers for a thousand years. Half a century before Aristophanes wrote his parody on social utopias, various

Greek poets produced satires on the myth of the Golden Age. Lovejoy and Boas reproduce or mention half a dozen such. The following by Teleclides (about 440 B.C.) is typical:

I shall then recount from the beginning the life which I provided for mortals. First there was peace among all things like water covering one's hands. And the earth bore neither fear nor disease, but all needed things appeared of their own accord. For every stream flowed with wine, and barley cakes fought with wheat cakes to enter the mouths of men, pleading to be gulped down if they loved the whitest. And fishes, coming to men's houses and baking themselves, would serve themselves upon the tables. And a river of soup flowed by the couches, swirling hot meats. And pipes conducting sharp sauces ran beside those wishing them, so that there was a plenty to moisten one's mouthfuls and permit one to swallow them tender. And on the dishes would appear honeyed barley cakes strewn over with spices, and roasted thrushes with milk cakes flew down one's gullet. And there were pancakes elbowing each other aside at one's jaw and shouting their war cries.[2]

Kirby Flower Smith writes: "As the Golden Age ceased to be an article of faith, it became, more and more, the field in which these thinkers aired their theories of what the world ought to be. From this sort of thing it was only a step to that long line of Utopian romances which were quite as characteristic of late antiquity as they are of the present day." [3]

Legends of supposedly actual good societies kept pace with sheer mythology. Smith states:

Piety and justice as *motifs* in the ideal of happiness had been ascribed, long before Hesiod's time, to peoples living beyond the limits of the known world. Such were Homer's *Abioi* (Il. xiii. 6), "the most righteous of men," and, to give one more example, the Hyperboreans, so long famous in the literature and legend of the Graeco-Roman world.[4]

Not only remote peoples but distant times contributed to these legends. Sophisticated Rome, looking back to the simple democratic life of its beginnings, celebrated that idyllic memory at the Saturnalia, which still survives in diluted form in the New Year's celebrations of our larger cities. This description is by Pompeius Trogus (first century):

The first inhabitants of Italy were the Aborigines, whose king, Saturn, is said to have been so just that there were no slaves under him nor any private property, but all things belonged to all in common and undivided, as if all men had one patrimony. In memory of this precedent it was decreed that during the Saturnalia, by a leveling of all men's rights, slaves should sit down at banquets with their masters indiscriminately.[5]

Among the more purely mythological stories of distant peoples were those concerning the Hyperboreans of the far north and the Aethiopians of the south, though even in these accounts there are traces of reality. While the tradition is at least as old as Homer, a description by Pomponius Mela, of the first century, is typical:

On the Asiatic shore the Hyperboreans are first found, lying beyond the Northwind and beyond the Rhiphaean mountains and under the very pole. There the sun does not rise every day as among us, but having arisen first at the time of the vernal equinox, it does not sink until the autumnal. Thus there is a continuous day of six months and a night of another six. The narrow sunny land is spontaneously fertile. The inhabitants are very just and live longer than any other mortals and more happily. In fact, always happy with festive leisure, they know neither wars nor altercation. . . . They inhabit woods and groves; and when sufficiency of living rather than boredom has come upon them, laughingly they wreath their heads with garlands and throw themselves headlong into the sea from a certain rock. This is their strange funeral rite.[6]

Most conspicuous among actual historic peoples to whom utopian traits were attributed were the Scythians, who inhabited the great plains of eastern Europe and western and central Asia. Accounts of them run through several centuries of Greek and Roman literature. Some are clearly mythological; others evidently record at first hand the visits of travelers. Since the name carried through a long period of time, and was applied to various tribes over a great extent of territory, it is not surprising that accounts vary greatly. One of the more utopian passages is by the Greek, Strabo, in his *Geography*, written in the first century B.C. He discusses the difference between Scythian tribes, some being cruel and others humane. Quoting Homer and Hesiod, he says of these people:

> We consider them the simplest and the least crafty, and more thrifty and self-sufficient than we. And yet life in our manner has spread to almost all peoples a change for the worse, introducing luxury among them, and pleasures and evil practices and countless selfish acts. Hence much of this type of evil has penetrated to the Barbarians, to others as well as to the Nomads....
>
> Anacharsis and Abaris [who were Scythians] and certain others of this type were well thought of among the Greeks, because they showed the national character of good temper, plain-living, and justice....
>
> There are some of the Scythian Nomads who feed on mare's milk and in their justice surpass all, and the poets recall them to mind. Homer says, "The milk-drinking Abioi, the most righteous of men," speaking of Zeus looking down upon the land, and Hesiod in the so-called *Circuit of the Earth* says that Phineas was driven by the Harpies "into the land of the milk-drinkers who have houses on wagons." And he explains this on the ground that being thrifty and not business men, they are well-behaved towards one another, and have all things in common, their wives and children and their whole kin. Yet they are unconquerable by foreigners, for they have nothing for which they might be enslaved.[7]